New Series *Volume VIII, Number 32* *November 1957*

The Review of English Studies

A Quarterly Journal of English Literature and the English Language

Editors
PETER ALEXANDER
NORMAN DAVIS

Assistant Editor
JEAN ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

Some Early Mercian Manuscripts. By Sherman M. Kuhn . 355
Daniel's Revision of his *Cleopatra*. By Ernest Schanzer . 375
Marvell and the New Critics. By Pierre Legouis . . 382
Two Fragments of Walsh Manuscripts. By Phyllis Freeman 390
The Third Man at Newgate. By William J. Carlton . . 402

NOTES

A Hundred-Name (Eilert Ekwall) 408
The Trial of the Princes in the *Arcadia*, Book V (D. M. Anderson) 409
James Shirley's Years of Service (J. P. Feil) . . . 413
Some Annotations in the Second Earl of Oxford's Copies of Pope's *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* and *Sober Advice from Horace* (Maynard Mack) 416

CORRESPONDENCE

Edward Alleyn's Draft Letter to John Donne (Baird W. Whitlock) 420

(*Continued at foot of next page*)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. Bennett; John Butt; R. W. Chapman; H. B. Charlton; Una M. Ellis-Fermor; Sir Ifor Evans; Sir Walter Greg; Sir Herbert Grierson; Edith J. Morley; Allardyce Nicoll; Percy Simpson; Kenneth Sisam; D. Nichol Smith; James R. Sutherland; Alice Walker; Dorothy Whitelock; F. P. Wilson; J. Dover Wilson; C. L. Wrenn.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.

An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England, by Peter Hunter Blair, 422; The Ancrene Riwle, translated and edited by M. B. Salu, 424; English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages, by Hardin Craig, 426; The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, by J. W. Lever, 429; *Cymbeline*, edited by J. M. Nosworthy (Arden Shakespeare), 432; The Sermons of John Donne, Volumes II and VII, edited by G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson, 434; Milton and Forbidden Knowledge, by Howard Schultz, 443; The Works of John Dryden, Volume I, Poems 1649–1680, edited by E. N. Hooker and H. T. Swedenberg, 445; Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Volumes I and II, edited by Earl Leslie Griggs, 448; Herman Melville: Journal of a Visit to Europe and the Levant, edited by Howard C. Horsford, 450; Interpretations, edited by John Wain, 451; Studies in Bibliography, Volume VIII, edited by Fredson Bowers, 454; Short Notices, 456; Summary of Periodical Literature, 458; List of Publications Received, 461; Index, 465.

PRELIMINARY ESSAYS

John Wain

'This is the liveliest book by a young English critic to come out for several years. Even the reader who is ready to quarrel with some of Mr. Wain's particular judgments will not be able to put the volume down. Spluttering with fury, such a reader will still want to know what Mr. Wain is going to say next.' *The Times.* 15*s.*

BARTLETT'S FAMILIAR QUOTATIONS

The first English reprint of the Thirteenth Edition. Contains 1,068 pages of quotations, and an index of nearly 113,500 entries. 50*s.*

MACMILLAN & CO. LTD.

St. Martin's Street, London, W.C. 2

NOVUM GLOSSARIUM MEDIAE LATINITATIS

ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC edendum curavit Consilium Academiarum Consociatarum

Since 1920 national committees of some 20 countries have been working, under the auspices of the Union Académique Internationale, on this entirely new Dictionary of Medieval Latin. There are now ready the Index Scriptorum, 194 pages, subscription price £4. 5*s.** and the fascicule comprising the letter 'L', 232 columns, £2. 2*s.* 6*d.** Altogether the work will, it is estimated, comprise about 4,640 pages, quarto. The rate and order of publication will depend upon editorial factors that cannot entirely be foreseen, but it is intended to publish one or two fascicules each year, the next to be 'M' and 'N' (in 1958).

This great new work of reference will be of immense help to all who are concerned with Latin texts of the Middle Ages. Definitions are in French.

* *Available separately at about* 10% *higher price.*

British Distributors W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED Cambridge, England

The History of Fanny Burney

JOYCE HEMLOW

This *History* does not stop with Fanny Burney's marriage in 1793 but goes on to 1840, covering her years as 'the famous Madame d'Arblay'. It reflects the lively Burney letters, with their personal revelations and references to sorrows, errors, or sins, as well as joys and triumphs, and contains much new information about her contemporaries found in hitherto suppressed sections of the *Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay*. Illustrated 35*s*. net FEBRUARY

Contexts of Criticism

HARRY LEVIN

A collection of essays by a well-known American critic and writer. Individual writers are discussed, Cervantes, Melville, the link between Balzac and Proust, Joyce and Hemingway, and there are more general essays on symbolism and fiction, on the function of criticism today, and the relation between English and American writing. (Harvard U.P.) 30*s*. net 17 OCTOBER

Joseph Conrad

Achievement and Decline

THOMAS COLBORN MOSER

The main thesis of this book is that the theme of love was almost without exception disastrous to Conrad's work as a novelist. The study has three general sections: an introductory statement analysing Conrad's technical and moral approach to the novel; a study of what is unsuccessful in his early and undoubtedly great novels; lastly an analysis of the later novels where the theme of love began to play an increasingly major role. (Harvard U.P.) 25*s*. net NOVEMBER

Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles

Love's Labour's Lost (1598)

Edited by SIR WALTER GREG

This facsimile has been reproduced from the copy in the British Museum (C. 34, 1. 14: Heber-Daniel). 25*s*. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

SOME EARLY MERCIAN MANUSCRIPTS

By SHERMAN M. KUHN

THE following manuscripts were, in my opinion, produced in or near Lichfield during the eighth and early ninth centuries:[1] (1) the Vespasian Psalter (British Museum MS. Cotton Vespasian A I); (2) the Golden Gospels of Stockholm (Royal Library, Stockholm, MS. A. 135); (3) the Prayer Book of Æðelwald the Bishop (as found in the Book of Cerne, Cambridge University Library MS. Ll. I. 10); (4) the Gospels of BM. MS. Royal I E VI; and (5) the Mercian manuscript of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (BM. Cotton Tiberius C II). I wish to answer some of Dr. Kenneth Sisam's objections to this view[2] and to comment on questions raised by F. Masai, Carl Nordenfalk, Wilhelm Levison, and Mary P. Parsons.

I. *The Relationship of the Manuscripts*

Because the manuscripts listed above show striking similarities in their ornamentation, while differing in important respects from other contemporary books, E. H. Zimmermann attributed all five to a single school of illumination.[3] This is not the place for a recapitulation of the evidence on which Zimmermann's opinion was based;[4] that can best be studied in his own work, especially in his plates. I wish only to point out that, although the attribution to a single school is not universally accepted, the evidence itself has yet to be effectively attacked. Sisam discusses a few of the problems involved in the tracing of manuscript relationships (pp. 4–6), but he nowhere counters Zimmermann's data, either by showing that the similarities of ornamentation do not exist or by showing that the artistic features involved are shared by manuscripts unrelated to the group under consideration.[5] Nor does Sisam make any direct attack upon Zimmermann's

[1] For evidence, see 'The Vespasian Psalter and the Old English Charter Hands', *Speculum*, xviii (1943), 458–83; 'From Canterbury to Lichfield', ibid., xxiii (1948), 591–629. References to these articles will consist of '*Sp.*' plus page numbers.

[2] 'Canterbury, Lichfield, and the Vespasian Psalter', *R.E.S.*, N.S. vii (1956), 1–10, 113–31. Dr. Sisam raises more objections than I can hope to answer in one short article.

[3] *Vorkarolingische Miniaturen* (Berlin, 1916), Text, pp. 131–6, 286–96; plates 204a, 280–96. A sixth member is added to the group (p. 289; pl. 285b), but little is said about the exact provenance of Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 281, 298 or about its relationship to the other MSS.

[4] I reviewed part of this evidence, *Sp.* 591–2.

[5] Differences between the earlier MSS. (VPs., Golden Gospels) and the later three can be accounted for in terms of age. Sisam (p. 5, n. 2) calls attention, in a misleading manner, to Sir Thomas Kendrick's comments on Æðelwald's Prayer Book in *Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900* (London, 1938). It is true that Kendrick observes 'northern' (not necessarily

comparative method,[1] although he refers to *Vorkarolingische Miniaturen* as a 'pioneer survey', implying perhaps that it contains errors in method or ill-considered views not found in later studies. The fact of the matter is that, apart from Kendrick, Zimmermann is the most recent authority on manuscript illumination mentioned in Sisam's article. Still regarded as one of the foremost authorities in its field, Zimmermann's work is built upon the investigations of Westwood, Thompson, Warner, and others; and the method used is basically the same as that of these earlier scholars.

The artistic evidence of relationship is supported by other evidence, linguistic (*Sp.* 605–7, 615–19, 621–2, 625–6) and palaeographical (*Sp.* 460–6, 481, 594–5, 610–11, 626–7), which has been attacked only in part. Although Sisam argues that the pure Mercian dialect of the Vespasian gloss is not incompatible with a Kentish provenance (pp. 124–7), he does not question any of the dialect features which are shared by the vernacular portions of the manuscripts and which point to a common dialectal background for the group. Although he questions the value of the three special letter-forms (which I have called 'Mercian *g*', 'Mercian *t*', and 'Anglian *ð*') for the localization of manuscripts (p. 118),[2] he attacks very little of the paleographical evidence in so far as it links the five books and reveals their common scribal background. He asserts that the Vespasian Psalter and the Golden Gospels are not especially similar in their script (pp. 115–16), but immediately concedes that one type of uncial *g* which they have in common 'may be an indication that they come from the same place or the same district'.[3] In discussing Æðelwald's Prayer Book (pp. 118–19), he attacks two doubtful examples of Anglian *ð* in the vernacular exhortation to prayer (but makes no mention of Anglian *ð* in the early glosses of this manuscript) and states that Mercian *g* and *t* are 'not characteristic' of the Latin text (although he admits that they occur and makes no mention of the Mercian

Northumbrian) and 'barbaric' features in this MS. (pp. 166–7), but he also sees 'barbaric' and 'northern' features in VPs. (pp. 159–61); differences in these respects appear, therefore; to be differences of degree rather than of kind.

[1] When MSS. are markedly similar in illumination or script and markedly different from other contemporary works, it is customary (unless there is positive evidence to the contrary) to assume that they are products of the same 'school'. Many examples illustrating this procedure could be cited from the works of eminent scholars, but I judge that it is unnecessary to labour a point which seems so obvious.

[2] He uses the *g* and the *ð* (pp. 118–19, n. 5) as evidence of the Mercian origin of another MS.

[3] These two MSS. are even more alike in their letter-forms than I supposed in 1948 (*Sp.* 610). Through the kindness of Dr. Edmon Lowe, Head Librarian of the Oklahoma A. & M. College, and O. Wieselgren, Chief Librarian of the Royal Library, Stockholm, I have been able to examine a microfilm of the entire Golden Gospels. Both types of *g* found in the Latin text of VPs. occur frequently in the Gospel MS.; the absence of one type from the published specimens of the latter is accidental. A *y* which rises above the line occurs occasionally in the Gospels, e.g. on f. 17^{v}; and a *y* descending below the line appears rarely in VPs., e.g. on ff. 42^{v}, 68^{r}.

letter-forms in the exhortation). Other palaeographical evidence linking the manuscript group seems to have gone unchallenged.

Zimmermann's procedure in localizing all manuscripts of a single school in a single place seems to me thoroughly sound. Sisam objects that it is hard to distinguish the products of the chief centre of a school (in his view, Canterbury) from those of a subsidiary centre (p. 5), but most scholars would regard this difficulty as of no practical importance unless there is real evidence that a sub-centre existed. In his section II, Sisam mentions no centre of manuscript production subsidiary to Canterbury.[1] Zimmermann's error, which lay in fields marginal to his own field of manuscript art, was that of localizing the five manuscripts at Canterbury. He accepted the view (based on dubious non-artistic evidence, but more or less traditional since Westwood) that the Vespasian Psalter and the Golden Gospels were of Canterbury origin, and he neglected or misinterpreted the non-artistic evidence found in the Prayer Book and the Mercian Bede. It is on these grounds that I have accepted Zimmermann's assignment of the five manuscripts to a single school in a single place, while rejecting his view that the place was Canterbury.

Evidence for the provenance (in some cases, the date) of the individual manuscripts will be re-examined in the following sections. I believe that any evidence positively linking any of the five either to Lichfield or to Canterbury must be regarded as evidence for the group as a whole.

II. *The Vespasian Psalter*

The provenance of the Vespasian Psalter, so far as Sisam is concerned, hinges entirely upon the identification of this manuscript with the second of the Gregorian Psalters described by Thomas of Elmham, fifteenth-century historian of St. Augustine's Abbey.[2] Sisam discusses the uncial script and the *Romana* text,[3] but he has abandoned Thompson's view that these point to a Canterbury origin (p. 7). He mentions Leland's description (p. 1, n. 2) but without treating it as evidence that the Vespasian Psalter was at St. Augustine's in Leland's day. This is reasonable, for the antiquarian was describing Elmham's Psalter, not necessarily the Vespasian Psalter. He makes no mention of C. R. Dodwell's statement that the first hand of BM. MS. Harley 603 is similar to that of certain additions in

[1] Elsewhere, he lists places in various parts of England 'capable of producing fine books' (p. 129). He offers no evidence that any of these had a school of illumination connected with that which is said to have existed at Canterbury in the 8th–9th centuries. For some of the towns, we have no evidence of MS. production during the period in question.

[2] *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*, ed. C. Hardwick (Rolls Series, 1858), p. 98.

[3] He does not mention the Morgan (formerly Blickling) Psalter and the Salaberga Psalter (*Sp.* 609).

Vespasian A 1.[1] To have done so would have been to admit very dubious evidence; for, although some scholars have supposed that Harley 603 was written at St. Augustine's, there is no certainty that this book ever belonged to the abbey.[2]

Sisam begins with an impressive list of 'the highest authorities on manuscripts', who appear to agree in believing that Elmham's description precisely fits the Vespasian Psalter, and whose expert opinion is disputed only by 'two specialists in Old English' (pp. 1–2). The catalogue of experts does not distinguish between scholars who have made some obviously independent contribution to the problem (e.g. Wanley) and those who have merely accepted an earlier opinion. It is not my intention to disparage the work of men who, when compiling large reference books, are forced to accept some of their opinions ready-made; I merely point out that views cited in the list vary greatly in value. Moreover, one of the specialists in Old English, Henry Sweet, had very detailed knowledge of Vespasian A 1, probably greater knowledge than that possessed by any of the experts listed. The list itself is headed by the name of a scholar who was very certain that Elmham's Psalter could not be the Vespasian Psalter. Humphrey Wanley pointed out the similarity of the prefatory sections in the two manuscripts, not the similarity of the complete manuscripts.[3] In his opinion, the second Gregorian Psalter had been lost or destroyed (p. 173).

Because of the many discrepancies between Elmham's description as a whole and the Vespasian Psalter as a whole (*Sp.* 600–2), I share the opinion of Wanley and Sweet, that the two Psalters cannot have been the same. Sisam denies the existence of none of the discrepancies; instead, he tries to explain them in various ways (pp. 2–4). Several of his explanations seem to me implausible.

(1) It is inaccurate and misleading to say that Elmham overlooked article 2[4] (*Psalmi omnimodam*) because it is the only article in the opening folios of the Vespasian Psalter without an incipit or a separate heading. This item is clearly distinguished by its rubric and by its enlarged initial *P*; article 1 (*Omnis scriptura*) also lacks a heading and a formal incipit, being distinguished only by its rubric and the enlargement of its first five letters.

(2) The omission of article 7 (*Origo psalmorum*) is attributed to Elmham's supposed astuteness in perceiving that this and article 8 (*Nunc exposuimus*) are one preface and should be combined, regardless of the large *FINIT* which

[1] *The Canterbury School of Illumination 1066–1200* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 1.

[2] This is one of the books, formerly thought to be from St. Augustine's, rejected by N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London, 1941), p. 30.

[3] *Antiquæ Literaturæ Septentrionalis Liber Alter* (Oxford, 1705), p. 222.

[4] i.e. Item 2 in Maunde Thompson's list of contents: *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum*, ii (1884), 8–9.

separates these items in the Vespasian Psalter. It is unlikely that Elmham would see the two as a single item, for they were often (usually, I think) treated as separate prefaces when they appeared in medieval Psalters.[1] The connexion between the two lies in the fact that both were attributed to Jerome in some manuscripts.[2] But even if Elmham were sufficiently familiar with Jerome's works, genuine and spurious, to see this connexion, it is unlikely that he would misrepresent an arrangement which he believed to have had the approval of Gregory the Great, especially when the misrepresentation might confuse those who looked at his Psalter and might even arouse suspicion as to its genuineness.

(3) The suggestion that the Psalter proper in Vespasian A 1 formerly began with a portrait of Samuel is an unsupported conjecture. There is no evidence that the manuscript ever contained a portrait of Samuel, which would be without parallel as the frontispiece of an Anglo-Saxon Psalter. It is unlikely that the Vespasian Psalter opened with any full-page portrait having part of the Psalter text written on the verso. The illuminator(s) of this manuscript worked in a very different manner, as we may see in the portrait of David (f. 30^{v}), which was made on a separate sheet of vellum and sewn into the manuscript, the recto of the leaf being left blank. To get some notion of what the lost leaf at the beginning of the Psalter was really like, we may look at Psalms xvii, xxvi, xxxviii, &c., in which the first line is written very large and elaborately ornamented. We might expect Ps. i to be even more ornate, probably with the first verse filling the entire recto[3] and the rest of Pss. i–ii. 3 on the verso.

(4) Sisam thinks that Elmham passed over the Psalter itself and the canticles (which are clearly separated from the Psalms in the Vespasian Psalter), to single out three Ambrosian hymns at the end of the original manuscript. These hymns are not easy to single out in the manner suggested, for they are not set off from the canticles in any way: the first, *Hymnum ad matutinos*, begins part way down f. 152^{r} with a modest title (similar to those of the canticles), no change of script, and an Old English gloss like that of the preceding items. The metrical character of the hymns is not clearly indicated in the manuscript, the stanzas being arranged as

[1] S. Berger, 'Les Préfaces jointes aux livres de la Bible dans les manuscrits de la Vulgate', *Mémoires . . . à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres de l'Institut de France*, ser. i, vol. xi, pt. ii (Paris, 1904), pp. 41–42. Berger found the *Nunc exposuimus* as a separate preface in ten Psalters of the 8th–13th centuries; four of these also contained the *Origo psalmorum* as a separate preface. He found the latter in many MSS., of which he listed more than thirty.

[2] Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, xxx, col. 296, prints the *Origo psalmorum*, followed by only a small portion of *Nunc exposuimus*, as part of the letter to Damasus, from which article 5 was also excerpted and used as an independent preface.

[3] Cf. f. 139^{r} of the Lindisfarne Gospels, which is completely filled by a portion of Luke i. 1; or f. 11^{r} of the Golden Gospels, occupied by a portion of Matt. i. 18.

though they were verses of a psalm or canticle. Moreover, the canticles themselves are very different in selection and order from those in Psalters of Elmham's day; it is hard to see how anyone could examine the book minutely enough to single out the hymns without noting the unusualness of the canticles.

(5) We are told that Elmham would have no interest in the Old English gloss of the Vespasian Psalter. It would be no great shock to me to find that Elmham did not share my linguistic interests, but I should still be surprised at his ignoring the gloss altogether. Indeed, I should have thought that its presence in what he believed to be a Roman book would arouse his normal human curiosity and prompt him to give it special mention.

(6) It is hard to accept the suggestion that Elmham would recognize the uncial and rustic capital hands of the Vespasian Psalter as more ancient than the pointed insular hand of the gloss and the Carolingian minuscule of the added folios at the end. This assumes (rather dangerously, I think) that Elmham had acquired a great deal of palaeographical lore from early manuscripts, for all four hands were obsolete in the fifteenth century.[1] If he were expert enough to know that the capital and uncial hands are older (i.e. in origin only, for they continued in occasional use long after the pointed insular was fully developed and often appear in the same page with Carolingian minuscule), he would surely be acquainted with the Carolingian uncials, which are very similar to those of the Vespasian Psalter and obviously later than Gregory's time.

(7) Sisam's explanation of the discrepancies between Elmham's foliation and that of the Vespasian Psalter (p. 2, n. 4) is also difficult to accept. If Elmham was not interested in exact folio numbers, if they were 'not important for his purpose',[2] why was he so careful to record the number each time a new item began on a new folio? Why, indeed, did he bother to record folio numbers at all? The last sentence of the note requires more detailed comment. Elmham's foliation does not fall behind that of the Vespasian Psalter at f. 4;[3] hence, the statement that 'a regularly written manuscript which fell behind at ff. 4, 6, 7 . . . would not come right at 5, 8, 11' is irrelevant, even if true. The statement seems to imply, however, that Elmham's foliation is an impossible one, that it could not fit even the Psalter described by Elmham. To meet this implied objection, I shall present a reconstruction of the prefatory section described by Elmham, with

[1] Thompson, *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford, 1912), pp. 403–90; esp. pp. 450–64.

[2] What was Elmham's purpose in his detailed description of the Gregorian books? Would it be reasonable to assume that he set out to describe them in such a way that they could be positively identified from his description and shown the respect due them?

[3] To see what is meant by 'falling behind', see *Sp.* 601–2.

his foliation intact and with every item that he mentions correctly placed.[1] I must first note some of the problems involved.

First, Elmham gives only the folio on which an item begins: he never mentions where an incipit appears on the folio, not even whether it is on the recto or the verso. As far as the Vespasian Psalter is concerned, items begin in various positions: *Origo psalmorum* at the bottom of 4^{v}, *Nunc exposuimus* at the bottom of 5^{r}, *Interpretatio psalmi cxviii* seven lines from the top of 6^{v}, &c. I assume that Elmham's book was similar. Second, Elmham does not indicate precisely where his first item, *Omnis scriptura*, began on f. 1 of his book. I assume that it began at the top of the verso. Third, Elmham does not indicate exactly where his last prefatory item, *Interpretatio psalmorum*, ended. His words, 'usque ad folium undecimum, ubi incipit Textus Psalterii', &c., may mean that this item extended up to and included part of his f. 11,[2] or they may mean that it stopped at the end of f. 10. I have taken the former interpretation. Fourth, the columns per page and the line length in Elmham's Psalter can only be guessed at. I assume that his text was in single column and in lines containing approximately the same amount of text as those in the prefatory section of the Vespasian Psalter. Finally, we cannot know how 'regularly' Elmham's manuscript was written, but I assume that it was no more regular than the Vespasian Psalter. In the prefatory section of the latter, most folios have 31 lines to a page, but three (3^{v}, 5^{v}, 11^{v}) have fewer lines; in the Psalter proper, most folios have 22 lines to a page, but some have fewer and some more.[3] There are several places in the prefatory section where the text is obviously crowded (e.g. the bottom of 6^{r}, where the incipit of *Interpretatio gloriae*, &c., is crowded into the space at the end of a line of the preceding item), other places where it is loosely written and could easily be compressed (e.g. 6^{v}, where *Interpretatio psalmi cxviii* is in very short lines, leaving much vacant space at the right), and still others (especially ff. 9^{r}–11^{v}) where the text could be either expanded or contracted considerably by differing arrangements of the lines.

A possible reconstruction of Elmham's Psalter

1^{r}: blank or illuminated.[4]
1^{v}: Omnis scriptura, 26 lines;
2^{r}: continued, 26;
2^{v}: continued, 24–26.[5]

[1] This seems to me the most plausible of several possible reconstructions. It assumes approximately 26 lines per page.

[2] This use of *usque ad* would be familiar to Elmham; cf. Gen. vi. 7, 'Delebo . . . ab homine usque ad animantia'; Matt. i. 17, 'ab Abraham usque ad David, generationes quatuordecim', &c. See also the division of the Psalter into five books (Migne, xxx. 296, and probably in Elmham's Psalter): 'primus liber sic continetur a psalmo primo usque ad xl, secundus liber sic continetur a xli usque ad lxxi', &c.

[3] e.g., 64^{r} (14 lines), 81^{r} (20), 93^{r} (6), 84^{r} (24), 104^{r} (23), 127^{r} (23).

[4] Blank in VPs. (f. 2^{r}).

[5] 76 lines in VPs. (2^{v}–3^{v}); *Psalmi omnimodam*, 15 lines on 3^{v}, not in Elmham.

3r: Epistola Damasi, 17;
Versus ejusdem Damasi, 9;
3v: continued, 4;
Epistola Ieronymi, 18;
cum Hieron. versibus, 4;
4r: continued, 9.[1]
De Origine Psalmorum, 17;
4v: continued, 20–26.[2]
5r: Expositio de Alleluia, 26.[3]
5v: Interpretatio Gloriæ, 7.[4]
Interp. Ps. cxviii, 19;
6r: continued, 2.[5]
Quando psalli, 24;
6v: continued, 24;
Ordo Psalmorum, 2.[6]
7r: De literis Hebræis, 26;
7v: continued, 26;
8r: continued, 24–26.[7]
8v: Interpretatio Psalmorum, 26;
9r–11r: continued, 130;
11v: continued, 17–26.[8]
12: Portrait of Samuel.[9]

This reconstruction should be sufficient to demonstrate that Elmham's Psalter could have had the foliation given in his description.

Before we leave Elmham, there is one further point: even if Elmham had seen the Vespasian Psalter at Canterbury in the fifteenth century, that would not, in itself, be especially strong evidence that the eighth-century manuscript was written in Canterbury. As I have observed (*Sp.* 600),[10] numerous manuscripts written elsewhere found their way to Canterbury during the later Middle Ages.

Positive evidence linking the Vespasian Psalter with Mercia can be dealt

[1] 60 lines in VPs. (4r–4v); incipit of last item is on last line of preceding item; this incipit probably had a line to itself in Elmham's Psalter. *Origo psalmorum*, 31 lines on 4v–5r, was not in Elmham's Psalter, but the next item had a similar title.

[2] 32 lines in VPs. (5r–5v); begins *Nunc exposuimus* without title. In Elmham's Psalter, this item had an additional line for its title; its concluding portion was in an expanded form considerably longer than the corresponding part of this item in VPs. A two-line exposition of *Diapsalma*, top of 6r in VPs., is not mentioned by Elmham.

[3] 29 lines in VPs. (6r); appears as four items, each with its own title. Elmham's Psalter combined these into one item with a single title.

[4] 6 lines in VPs. (6r–6v); title crowded into last line of preceding item, but presumably had a separate line in Elmham's Psalter.

[5] 23 lines in VPs. (6v), but very loosely written.

[6] 50 lines in VPs. (6v–7v).

[7] 76 lines in VPs. (7v–8v).

[8] 173 lines in VPs. (9r–11v), plus an *AMEN*, two or three lines high. On 11v, there is also a seven-line prayer, *Suscipere digneris*, which Elmham does not mention.

[9] Not in VPs.

[10] Sisam objects to this observation on two scores (p. 4, n. 1). I gave no examples because the statement seemed to me beyond dispute; many examples may be had in the book to which Sisam refers, M. R. James, *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903). I cannot recall that James mentions any MS. 'from early Anglo-Saxon times that reached Canterbury after the Norman Conquest'—unless the Parker Chronicle be accepted as sufficiently early. Apart from the Golden Gospels, James did not venture to give more than cautious conjectures as to the dates at which MSS. comparable in age to VPs. arrived in Canterbury. Sisam errs in supposing that clerics in Canterbury after the Conquest had no reason to acquire a *Romana* Psalter with an OE. gloss (p. 4). The Eadwine Psalter, written at Canterbury in the 12th century, contains both. The fact that this is a tripartite Psalter, a type apparently unknown in England before the Conquest, suggests that the later clerics had a reason for acquiring the *Romana* which their predecessors of the Anglo-Saxon period lacked.

with only briefly here. The linguistic evidence of the Mercian gloss naturally points to Mercia. Sisam argues that this gloss could have been written in Kent during the period when West Saxon was the official dialect (pp. 122–8), but he nowhere denies that the gloss is Mercian. His views on the linguistic situation in Canterbury and on the effect (or lack of effect) of local speech upon the written language do not coincide with my own, but this is not the place for a lengthy review of the literature on these subjects.[1] The handwriting of the gloss resembles that of certain charters issued by Mercian kings in the early ninth century. In order to counter this evidence, Sisam has adopted a conception of the charters which I had supposed obsolete and a method of handling palaeographical evidence which is altogether different from my own (pp. 113–22). Again, it seems best to refrain from dissertations on fundamental questions at this time. The endorsement of King Æðelbald of Mercia on his uncial charter of 736 (Cott. Augustus II 3) differs in its script from the charter itself and contains some letter-forms resembling those of the Vespasian Psalter and the Golden Gospels (*Sp.* 610–11).[2] I believe that the objections to this evidence can be dealt with adequately here.

Sisam's opinion that 'the hand of the uncial endorsement is the same as that of the main charter' (p. 116) is untenable in view of important differences in the shapes of several letters.[3] These differences will be noted most clearly in the *a*, *b*, *d*, *g*, and *n*, somewhat less clearly in the *c* and *e*.[4] There are other indications that the endorsement was written at a different time from the charter, evidently later. The charter refers to the grantee, Cyneberht, as merely *comes*, but the endorsement gives him the added rank of *dux*. The place called *Brochyl*, an estate lying to the westward of the land granted for Cyneberht's new monastery, is not mentioned in the charter but is specifically granted to Cyneberht in the endorsement. The names of the forest *Moerheb* (or *Moreb*) and of the king are spelled differently in the two texts.[5] We may note the view of Miss Parsons, who supposed the endorsement to be earlier than the charter, i.e. a preliminary memorandum

[1] I must also pass over Sisam's argument that the gloss is a copy (p. 127, n. 1) and his remarks on the capital of Mercia (pp. 129–31).

[2] My analysis was based upon the very clear reproduction in *Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the British Museum*, i (1873), pl. 7. The darkness of some parts of my pl. II*a* and the errors in my transcription are not due to any obscurity in the original.

[3] E. A. Lowe regards the two hands as different and believes that the endorsement has a later appearance. His opinion is reported by Parsons, 'Some Scribal Memoranda for Anglo-Saxon Charters of the 8th and 9th centuries', *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, xiv Ergänzungsband (1939), 27.

[4] Sisam (p. 116, n. 5) admits that there are 'noticeable differences' between the letter-forms of the charter and those of the endorsement, and that there was probably an 'interval' between the writing of the two documents.

[5] The king's name is *edilbalt* in the endorsement; of the four occurrences in the charter, not one has the *d* (= *ð*) or the *e*; i.e. *aethil-* (twice), *aetdil-*, *ethil-*.

for the guidance of the scribe who wrote the charter.[1] This seems very improbable. In the first place, she was unable to show that the supposed memorandum was written earlier than the charter. In the second place, the scribe obviously made no use of this text in preparing the charter; if he had seen it at all, he would have mentioned Brochyl, given Cyneberht's correct title, and used some of the spellings of proper names found in the endorsement.

The date of the Latin text of the Vespasian Psalter, apart from its intrinsic importance, has some bearing upon the provenance. Zimmermann assigned the manuscript to the third quarter of the eighth century,[2] a date which nearly coincides with that proposed by Kendrick (*c.* 750 or a little later), and is not inconsistent with that of E. A. Lowe, who places the manuscript in the eighth century without any suggestion as to whether it is early, middle, or late.[3] Carl Nordenfalk questions Zimmermann's date, his argument being based upon resemblances between the arch of the David illumination on f. 30^{v} and certain ornaments in the mid-eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary (Vatican MS. Regin. lat. 316).[4] I agree with Nordenfalk's view as to the prevailing direction of cultural borrowing in the eighth century. If the resemblances indicate a borrowing, it is almost certainly a Frankish borrowing from the English rather than the reverse. But there is no evidence that the Vespasian Psalter was taken to the Continent during the eighth century or that the sacramentary was made in England. The imitation must, therefore, be indirect. It is possible that the Frankish artist had before him some book related to the Vespasian Psalter, perhaps an earlier work from the same school of illumination. If this explanation is correct, there is no real objection to dating the Psalter in the third quarter of the eighth century (or early in the reign of King Offa of Mercia).

III. *Other Manuscripts of the Lichfield Group*

Of the manuscripts, other than the Vespasian Psalter, mentioned at the beginning of this article, Royal 1 E VI can be dealt with most briefly. I have little to add to what I have said elsewhere (*Sp.* 612–13), although I should mention that Thompson was sceptical of the Canterbury origin of this manuscript,[5] while Lowe assigns it to 'South England in a Mercian or Kentish centre'.[6]

The Golden Gospels of Stockholm have been discussed in several studies which were not available to me in 1948. F. Masai rightly disputes

[1] Op. cit., p. 28.
[2] *Vorkarol. Min.*, p. 289.
[3] *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, ii (Oxford, 1935), pl. 193.
[4] 'A Note on the Stockholm Codex Aureus', *Nordisk Tidskrift för Bok- och Biblioteksväsen*, xxxviii (1951), 148–50.
[5] *Introd. Palaeog.*, p. 386.
[6] *Cod. Lat. Ant.*, ii, pl. 214.

the assignment of this book to Canterbury and argues for a more northerly provenance.[1] Because its ornamentation resembles that of a number of manuscripts made at Tours in Alcuin's time, he suggests that the Golden Gospels may have originated in York, where Alcuin no doubt obtained some of the models for his pupils at Tours to imitate. This is a plausible suggestion, but our present lack of specific information regarding manuscript production in eighth-century York would seem to render it incapable of proof or disproof. I may point out, however, that Alcuin's connexions in England were not exclusively with York. He spent some time in Mercia and was on rather intimate terms with King Offa.[2] It is very likely that Alcuin and his followers drew upon Mercian as well as Northumbrian resources when obtaining manuscripts for the school at Tours.

Nordenfalk holds that certain ornaments in the Golden Gospels were inspired by the *carmina figurata* of Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius.[3] I am inclined to accept this view but fail to see how it supports Nordenfalk's claim that the book must have been made at Canterbury. He quotes (from E. Kylie's text) part of a letter of Bishop Milred of Worcester:[4] 'Librum pyrpyri [Porfyri] metri ideo non misi, quia Gutbertus episcopus adhuc reddere distulit.' He identifies Gutbertus with Cuðberht, Archbishop of Canterbury, *c.* 740–*c.* 758, and accepts the emendation of *pyrpyri* to *Porfyri*. From these data, he argues that the book was written in Canterbury during Cuðberht's archiepiscopate. The evidence could be used equally well to prove that it was made at Worcester before Cuðberht borrowed the Porfyrius (*?purpureus*), or after its return. Or the evidence could be used to support a Hereford provenance, for Cuðberht was bishop of that diocese before his translation to Canterbury. Any one of these three places of origin could be defended—if it could be shown that Worcester had a unique copy of the poet. There is reason to believe, however, that several eighth-century writers from various parts of England had access to the works of Porfyrius.[5]

A Canterbury provenance is rendered unlikely by Aldormon Ælfred's statement that he and his wife purchased the Golden Gospels in pagan territory (*in ðære haeðenesse*),[6] which Sisam endeavours to explain away (p. 8, n. 3). There is nothing new in my interpretation of *hæðenes* as 'pagan territory',[7] nor have I misrepresented the Bosworth-Toller Supple-

[1] *Essai sur les origines de la miniature dite Irlandaise* (Brussels, 1947), p. 125.

[2] E. S. Duckett, *Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne* (New York, 1951), pp. 155–60; A. Kleinclausz, *Alcuin* (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, ser. 3, fasc. 15, Paris, 1948), pp. 71–77.

[3] Op. cit., pp. 152–5.

[4] Also ed. by M. Tangl, *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus* (Mon. Germ. Hist., Berlin, 1916), pp. 243–5.

[5] Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), p. 145.

[6] Dedicatory inscription on f. 11^{r} of the MS.; discussion, *Sp.* 592–4.

[7] Cf. Clark Hall, *Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Cambridge, 1931), 'heathen country'; or *O.E.D.*, 'Heathendom, the heathen world; the lands outside Christendom', &c.

ment on this point.[1] *Hǣðen(n)es* (*heathenesse*) has two meanings in Old and Middle English: (1) the condition or quality of paganism, (2) pagan territory. It is similar to a number of other OE. *jō*-stems, in having both abstract and concrete meanings; e.g. *digolnes* 'solitariness, secrecy' and 'secret place, hiding place', *dimnes* 'darkness, obscurity' and 'dark place', *fæstnes* 'firmness, stability' and 'stronghold', *hēahnes* 'highness, loftiness' and 'high place, top, summit'. Since Ælfred's inscription contains the only surviving OE. example of *hæðenes* in the sense of something that a book could be in, the parallels must be sought in Middle English. I can find no ME. evidence supporting Sisam's interpretation of *in ðære haeðenesse* ('with heathens') or any of the other *ad hoc* interpretations ('among heathens', 'in heathen hands', &c.) devised by scholars who were already convinced that Ælfred must have found his book in Canterbury. Although the definition of *hæðenes* as 'heathen territory in England' is not mine and seems to me too narrow and specific, the term could be applied to English territory. The thirteenth-century legend of Gregory the Great in Bodleian MS. Laud 108 contains a familiar anecdote, in the course of which Gregory is told that 'al engelond is puyr heþenesse'.[2] There is also the line in *Piers Plowman*, B. xv. 435: 'Al was hethenesse some tyme Ingelond and Wales.'

One further point should be mentioned briefly. Ælfred was apparently an earl of Surrey, who received the earldom after 853 and had estates in both Surrey and Kent.[3] Whether or not he was himself a Mercian, or whether he had possessed estates in Mercia prior to the Danish conquest, we shall probably never know. But there is no denying his connexions with Mercia, for both his dedicatory inscription and his will (Stowe charter xix) are in the same dialect, which is neither that of Surrey (as inferred from ME. evidence) nor that of Kent, but a variety of Mercian.[4] Since these documents were written *c.* 871–89, they belong to a time when West Saxon, not Mercian, was the official dialect of south-eastern England.

MS. Cotton Tiberius C II is not generally regarded as a Northumbrian book. As I have shown elsewhere (*Sp.* 613–14), the two unusual readings which led Charles Plummer to assign it to Lindisfarne[5] can be explained without the assumption of a Lindisfarne provenance; but further examination of this evidence is now necessary. The error *meditaturum*, shared by

[1] In the second definition in B.T.S., 'people among whom (or district in which) heathenism prevails', Toller presumably used 'people' as a collective, i.e. 'a people, nation, race', &c., rather than as a mere equivalent for 'persons, individuals'.

[2] C. Horstmann, *The Early South-English Legendary* (E.E.T.S., O.S. 87, 1887), p. 356.

[3] F. E. Harmer, *Select English Historical Documents* (Cambridge, 1914), p. 88.

[4] E. Ekwall, 'On the Old English Fracture of *a*', *English Studies*, V (1923), 61–63. In my opinion, both documents show the influence of WS. spelling practices.

[5] *Venerabilis Baedae Historia Ecclesiastica* (Oxford, 1896), I, pp. xciii-xciv.

Symeon of Durham's quotation from Bede, is not a unique reading[1] and cannot therefore be treated as proof that Symeon had direct access to Tiberius C II. Apparently Sisam recognizes this fact, for he refers to the reading as 'evidence that Tiberius C II, *or a closely related lost manuscript*, was at Durham' (pp. 8–9, italics mine). The second reading, *nostro*, is loosely handled by Sisam. The phrase is 'de sanctissimo patre et antistite Cudberchto', and the abbreviation *nr̄o* is inserted after *patre*. If the insertion were after *antistite*, it might suggest Lindisfarne, i.e. 'our bishop'. After *patre*, it merely suggests that the Northumbrian Cuðberht was venerated in the place where the insertion was made. Bede himself could be the ultimate source of this addition to his text, for he was familiar with the use of *pater* to designate someone who was looked upon as a sort of spiritual forbear. One example appears in Gregory's letter to Augustine (as quoted by Bede), 'quae initio nascentis ecclesiae fuit patribus nostris', where Gregory is speaking of the early Church at Jerusalem rather than of his predecessors at Rome. Another will be found in Colman's speech at Whitby, 'Numquid reuerentissimum patrem nostrum Columbam', &c., in which the bishop refers to a spiritual father who died before his see of Lindisfarne was founded.[2] It should be clear, therefore, that Plummer's evidence is much weaker than Sisam supposes.

The date of the *nr̄o* does not seem to have any important bearing upon the provenance of the manuscript. No matter what other theories we may devise to account for the insertion, we must always recognize that it could have been due simply to comparison with another manuscript. A contemporary corrector, having seen it elsewhere (perhaps in a marginal note which he mistook for a textual correction), could have inserted it in Tiberius C II. Or a later scribe could have made the insertion for the same reason. I believe, however, that the date has some importance in itself. Plummer regarded *nr̄o* as considerably later than the original manuscript. Ker's opinion, as reported by Sisam, would make the insertion virtually contemporary. Mr. T. J. Brown, an Assistant Keeper in the Department of Manuscripts of the British Museum, after a most painstaking study of the problem, reports that the date cannot be determined with certainty: the insertion could be contemporary with the manuscript or as late as the twelfth century, but the balance of probabilities is that it was made during the Anglo-Saxon period by a hand appreciably later than those of the original scribe and the original corrector(s).[3]

[1] Plummer found it as an alternative reading in a 14th-century Bede MS. with Salisbury connexions; ibid., i, pp. cxiii–cxiv.

[2] Ibid., i. 48, 187.

[3] I append excerpts from Brown's letter of 13 Sept. 1956: '*Nostro* in Tiberius C. ii, f. 4, col. i, l. 5, in the phrase *sanctissimo patre (nostro) et antistite cudberchto*, is written above and between the words on either side of it, and is spelled *nr̄o*. The ink is very like that of

Against Plummer's evidence, there is other and much stronger evidence, all of which points to Mercia (*Sp.* 615–19). This need not be repeated here, but I should like to mention the proper names in Tiberius C II, many of which have been transliterated from their original Northumbrian forms, so as to differ from the corresponding names found in other early manuscripts of Bede. In such cases, the spellings of this manuscript often reflect a phonology resembling that of other texts generally regarded as Mercian; e.g. *badudegn* is re-spelled *beaduðegn* (Merc. *ea* by velar umlaut), *earpualdo* becomes *eorpuualdo* (Merc. *eo* instead of Nhb. *ea*), and *aedilredum* becomes *aeðelredum* (Merc. *el* for earlier Nhb. *il*).[1]

The Prayer Book of Æðelwald the Bishop is one of the few books of the Anglo-Saxon period that can be dated and localized with certainty and without any delicate weighing and balancing of comparative evidence. It contains the name of an easily identified bishop in an acrostic (*AEDEL-VALDEPISCOPVS*), who can be none other than Æðelwald of Lichfield, 818–30. This is supported by a variant of his name, *Oeðelwald*, in the heading of a versicularius later in the manuscript. Both occurrences of his name are contemporary; i.e. they are part of the original text.[2] The versicularius has some value in itself, some reason for being in the book regardless of who the compiler was; but the acrostic is without literary or devotional value and would be of interest only to the man whose name it records.[3]

The objections to this evidence mentioned by Sisam (pp. 9–10) do not seem to me unanswerable. The first is Edmund Bishop's argument that an Irish element in some of the hymns and prayers of the manuscript precludes a date as late as the ninth century.[4] I have already dealt at some length with this argument and have shown that the presence of Irish influence is no

the main text at this point . . . the *r* is the Anglo-Saxon minuscule letter . . . and the bar above it looks as if it had been made by an Anglo-Saxon, but the *n* and the *o* are rather less well formed and the *n* has 'feet' to the minims, which is unusual, though not unknown, in the main text. . . . [The insertion] seems to be rather less well written than the insertions which are undoubtedly by, or contemporary with, the first hand, among which even single words . . . often have *signes de renvoi* (e.g. ff. 11b, 19b); and there is at least a possibility that it is by one of the 12th cent. hands which have made additions here and there throughout the MS., since they occasionally use the Anglo-Saxon minuscule *r* (e.g. ff. 20b, 31b, 141b) and the corresponding *g* (e.g. ff. 27b, 40). . . . I think your insertion is probably Anglo-Saxon, though probably not by the first hand or by the original corrector(s).'

[1] The Nhb. form in each pair is that of the Moore MS. For further data, see H. Ström, *Old English Personal Names in Bede's History* (Lund, 1939).

[2] The evidence (regarded as conclusive by Sisam, p. 6) for the origin of the Lindisfarne Gospels is in an inscription at least two centuries later than the book.

[3] I note the statement that the connexion of this MS. with Æðelwald is 'not the same thing as evidence that the book was produced at Lichfield' (p. 10). Sisam offers no evidence that Æðelwald had his book written for him at another place. Lacking such evidence, one would normally assume that a book written for a bishop was written at his own cathedral; e.g. Sisam (p. 6) assumes that Bishop Eadfrið's MS. was written at Lindisfarne, although the inscription does not say in so many words that the MS. was made there.

[4] *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918), pp. 165–202; esp. pp. 172–3, 192–7.

obstacle to our accepting a provenance in ninth-century Lichfield (*Sp.* 623–5). I should add, perhaps, that the *Hymnarius* of Æðilwald of Lindisfarne, as reconstructed by Bishop, is purely hypothetical.

The second objection is based upon questions very tentatively raised by a scholar who referred to his suggestions as 'mere possibilities'.[1] Levison's suggestion that the compiler of the Prayer Book might have substituted *el* for an original Northumbrian *il* in the versicularius is a possibility, of course, but in the absence of any evidence, it can be nothing more.[2] As to the acrostic, Levison queried whether, in the fourth line (*Ei beata*, &c.),[3] Æðilwald of Lindisfarne might not have used the second letter of *ei* rather than the first in spelling out his name. This question is best answered by another: what reason could the bishop have had for violating the rules of the acrostic in this manner? Levison cited examples of *extolle* and the like, used for the letter *x* in Latin rhythmical 'abecedarii', but these are hardly comparable. It is difficult to find Latin words with initial *x* that will make sense even in a stilted context; hence, the utilization of the second letter of *extolle*, &c., is understandable. The letter *i* is too common initially to present any such difficulty; any man capable of composing the acrostic could have written a line beginning with *I*.

The third objection, if its bases were less conjectural, would be an argument against Lindisfarne and in favour of Lichfield. Levison identified the anchorite Alchfrið, composer of some prayers in the manuscript, with the writer of an *Epistola Alchfriði Anachoritae ad Higlacum*. He believed that Hyglac was a monk at a Northumbrian monastery *c.* 780 and that the prayers were contemporary with the letter.[4] If he was correct on all points, the prayers are rather late to have been included in any collection made for Æðilwald of Lindisfarne, who died in 740.

In conclusion, I can see no reason to doubt that the Prayer Book of Æðelwald the Bishop originated at Lichfield.[5] Three of the related manuscripts (the Vespasian Psalter, the Golden Gospels, and Tiberius C II) have

[1] Levison, op. cit., p. 296.

[2] The Nhb. bishop would probably have written *Oi* for the *Oe* of *Oeðelred*.

[3] Levison's is not the MS. spacing; the MS. has *E ibeata*.

[4] Op. cit., pp. 301–2.

[5] I have suggested that the early glosses of this MS. were written at a centre under West Saxon influence (*Sp.* 622). Of the two possibly WS. features which I cited (lack of the second fronting of Gmc. *a* in *fæðmum*, &c., and unrounding of *ēa* in *hēla*), the second may not be due to WS. influence. The VPs. gloss also has *e* in this particular morpheme, i.e. in *hēlspuran*. Leonhardi held that the Lorica glosses go back to an 8th-century Mercian archetype (*Kleinere angelsächsische Denkmäler*, i (Bibl. der a.-s. Prosa vi, Hamburg, 1905), 206–15). This theory accounts for unusual features of the early Lorica glosses which I accept as archaisms and omitted in my discussion. If we can accept the *æ*-spellings in words like *fæðmum* as additional archaisms, we can also accept the opinion of Leonhardi and others (Bradshaw, Sweet, Warner) that these early glosses are contemporary with the MS., and presumably written in the same place.

obvious Mercian connexions, and the fifth manuscript of the group (Royal 1 E VI) has no early connexion with Canterbury. I, therefore, remain of the opinion that all five books originated in or near Lichfield.

Mr. Sisam writes:

I very much regret my error (above, p. 367) in reporting the reading of Tiberius C II as *patre et antistite* (*nostro*) *Cudberchto* where Plummer rightly gave *patre* (*nostro*) *et antistite Cudberchto*: it is no excuse that Dr. Kuhn himself twice referred to 'the insertion of *nostro* before the name of the saint' (*Speculum* (1948), 614, 628). I based no essential argument on the position of *nostro*, and the meaning is, I believe, the same in either case, with perhaps a difference of emphasis.[1] I slipped also (above, p. 360) in saying that Elmham's folio numbers 'fell behind' the original Vespasian at folios 4, 6, 7, where I should have said 'went ahead of'. Facts are precious, and I owe Dr. Kuhn and readers an apology.

I do not wish to change anything else in my criticism as a result of Dr. Kuhn's reply, nor can I accept any of his additional arguments for a Lichfield origin of the five manuscripts under discussion, or of the Vespasian Psalter separately. It is noteworthy that among investigators old and new he has not found one who agrees with him in these main theses. And perhaps I should repeat my opinion, for what it is worth: that, on the evidence available, the five manuscripts were not all produced at Canterbury, or at Lichfield, or at any other place more closely defined than 'England south of the Humber'.

Readers who are not already weary of the controversy will, I hope, look again at the passages I criticized, the words and trend of my criticism, as well as the replies; and will not debit me with some strange opinions that Dr. Kuhn assigns to me for the pleasure of debating them. Sometimes he seems to me to take a point unfairly, as when he says (above, p. 356) that I 'make no mention of Anglian *ð* in the early glosses of [the Book of Cerne]'. How could I have foreseen that he would change his opinion that these glosses were not written at Lichfield,[2] a change that is first disclosed in a note at p. 369 above, where its relevance might easily be missed?

To go over all the differences between us would be long and tedious. As sample of his technical arguments, I choose the one to which he gives most space and most care—his reconstruction of the preliminaries of a lost

[1] Kuhn's parallels for *pater noster* are unhappy. Gregory's *patribus nostris* is the common unspecific use of the plural. Colman would naturally call St. Columba *pater noster* because he belonged to Columba's foundation at Iona (Bede, Bk. iv, ch. 4) and represented Columba's teaching at the Whitby conference.

[2] *Speculum* (1948), 622, 628, to which I referred expressly in *R.E.S.* (1956), 118. The change reinforces my doubts (in the same article pp. 122 ff.) about the value of phonological arguments for the exact localization of Anglo-Saxon MSS.

psalter which (and not the Vespasian Psalter) he supposes Elmham to describe exactly (above, pp. 360 ff.). A main difficulty he has to meet is his own assertion that this hypothetical psalter did not contain the article of 31 manuscript lines which is numbered 7 in the British Museum description of the Vespasian Psalter; whereas, on the plain meaning of Elmham's words, article 7 appears in its proper order. To quote Elmham with enough context to show his manner, notably the connecting of articles 3 and 4 by *et in fine*:

> In tertio folio incipit *Epistola Damasi papæ ad Ieronymum* [art. 3 in VPs.], et in fine *Versus eiusdem Damasi* [art. 4 in VPs.]; ac deinde *Epistola Ieronymi ad Damasum* [art. 5 in VPs.], cum *Ieronymi Versibus* [art. 6 in VPs.]. Deinde in quarto[1] folio *de Origine Psalmorum* [art. 7 in VPs. is headed, appropriately, *Incipit Origo Psalmorum*], in cuius fine distinguit Psalterium in quinque libros &c. [art. 8 in VPs.].

Note that article 8 in the Vespasian Psalter is patently a continuation of article 7. Exceptionally it has no heading, and it begins: 'Nunc exposuimus originem psalmorum, et modo exponimus quomodo Ebrei librum psalmorum diuidant in quinque libros.' To see the connexion Elmham needed nothing more than the knowledge of Latin he certainly had, and I do not know why Dr. Kuhn finds difficulties in such simple matters (p. 359 above).

He has nowhere given reasons for the assertion that article 7 was omitted in Elmham's Psalter. It may be inferred that, for some reason, he thinks it impossible that Elmham's *de Origine Psalmorum* could represent the Vespasian article 7 headed *Incipit Origo Psalmorum*. Then he supposes that there was no article on that topic before Elmham (above, p. 362, n. 1). Then that in the hypothetical psalter the heading *de Origine Psalmorum* was attached (quite inappropriately) to article 8 on the division of the Psalter (ibid.). So Elmham means 'Next, on folio 4, (the heading) *de Origine Psalmorum*, at the end of which (heading) he divides the Psalter into five books'! Every step is extraordinary, one might say perverse; and the method may be expected to give paradoxical results in any subject that depends on the interpretation of Latin sources. But if the ordinary meaning of Elmham's words is preferred, the reconstruction of his psalter without article 7 is impossible or fallacious.[2]

[1] The text of the VPs. article on the *Origin of the Psalms* begins on the last line of original f. 3^{v}; but I think the discrepancy unimportant because Elmham's purpose was to notice unusual features in the contents, which he supposed to have the authority of Gregory the Great. Kuhn thinks that his purpose in mentioning folios was to identify the precious Psalter (above, p. 360, n. 2). But the common way of identifying a manuscript was to note the opening words of its second folio, as we see in the 15th-century catalogue of St. Augustine's, Elmham's abbey; and Elmham does not even mention the second folio. Neglect of such considerations, and of others much more elementary (like the normal order of the canticles), runs through paras. 1–6 at pp. 358 ff. above.

[2] Freedom to choose the number of lines per page that was normal in the hypothetical

I pass to a more general topic—the use of authority. An earlier generation of scholars thought of a man and his *fach*—the special subject in which, by training, profession, and performance, he was reckoned competent to give an opinion or judgement. If an expert in one subject used evidence from another field, he took and quoted the advice of an acknowledged expert in that field. Latterly there has been a freer use in English studies of evidence from other fields, and a tendency for writers to give their own opinions, without always distinguishing the kind of question in which superficial knowledge is a treacherous guide.

Dr. Kuhn goes farther, testing specialists by the touchstone of his own views: they are good authorities if they help his argument, bad if adverse. For instance: as authorities who identified the Vespasian Psalter with Elmham's psalter, I cited Maunde Thompson, Warner, M. R. James, Traube as edited by Lehmann, Wilmart, and Lowe, believing them to be as strong a panel of critical, first-hand investigators as could be chosen on this issue. Palaeographers will be surprised to find them comprehensively discounted as 'men who, when compiling large reference books, are forced to accept some of their opinions ready-made' (above, p. 358).[1] In the previous article Edmund Bishop, the first authority on the contents of the Book of Cerne and its religious background, was disposed of by crude arguments and misunderstood in an essential point: 'A. B. Kuypers and Edmund Bishop . . . argue that it [*sc.* the Book of Cerne] is merely a copy of an earlier book compiled by Bishop Æðelwald of Lindisfarne' (*Speculum* (1948), 623). Kuypers's short statement is a model of caution.[2] In a passage of his *Liturgica Historica* to which Dr. Kuhn refers, Bishop argued at length against Traube's suggestion that the Book of Cerne is a copy of

codex, and the vagueness of Elmham's indications of position (above, p. 361), allow a great deal of play to ingenuity in the reconstruction of 11 folios. Thus, the preliminaries may have occupied one or both pages of the first folio, and all, part, or none of f. 11 (above, ibid.). Again, it is assumed (above, p. 362, n. 2) that article 8 was longer than the corresponding Vespasian article, unnecessarily because Elmham has no variation that he would not naturally make, and improbably unless a similar expanded copy of this common text can be cited, especially an early one. Up to 11 lines of the space left by the supposed omission of article 7 are immediately accounted for by this assumption; and there are other assumptions, e.g. about headings, that make for regular figures and Elmham's folio indications.

[1] Wanley is excepted as being a first-hand investigator because he did not identify the Vespasian Psalter with Elmham's. But his view as a whole is adverse. He said (*Catalogue*, p. 222) that Elmham's description of the preliminaries fitted the Vespasian MS. exactly (*ad amussim*). He accepted Elmham's statement that the books described were sent by Gregory the Great to Augustine (*Catalogue*, p. 173). But he saw, as no Englishman before him could see, that the Vespasian Psalter was English work of a considerably later date. From these data he drew the normal inference—that the Vespasian Psalter was a copy (*apographum*) of Elmham's Gregorian book. In that case the Vespasian Psalter would have an original connexion with Canterbury.

[2] *The Book of Cerne* (Cambridge, 1902), pp. xxix f.

the lost *Hymnarius Edilwaldi* (of Lindisfarne). Levison too, whose learning, acuteness, and careful thinking are freshly remembered, is confidently brushed aside, again with an element of misunderstanding (above, pp. 368 f.). It happens that he began by questioning the decisiveness of a linguistic argument of my own, which favours a Lichfield connexion for the Book of Cerne and which Dr. Kuhn now adopts. When a scholar of Levison's quality is doubtful, having clearly in mind a linguistic indication, but also others from his own special studies, should we not think that there is a difficulty; that some reconciling solution may be discoverable; even that we may be wrong?

By the same touchstone, an authority is unquestionable in one part and negligible in another. Zimmermann's attribution of all five manuscripts to one 'school' is taken to be obviously right; and his view that all manuscripts of one 'school' come from a single centre to be 'thoroughly sound' (above, p. 357), though it has not appeared so to later expert investigators.[1] His error lay in making the single centre for this particular 'school' Canterbury and not Lichfield (ibid.). But if he really goes wrong five times out of five in interpreting the history of the manuscripts, and if he cannot distinguish the products of places so far apart, geographically and historically, as Canterbury and Lichfield, should we not doubt his infallibility in distinguishing 'schools' that must be so narrowly localized?

Again, some authorities are quoted partially or obscurely, so that it is impossible to know their view without consulting them direct. An example within the province of English studies is the reference to Bosworth-Toller (*Speculum* (1948), 593):

> The two meanings of *heathenesse* found in Old and Middle English are recorded by the *New English Dictionary* and by Bosworth and Toller's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*: (*a*) 'The quality or condition of being heathen; the belief and practice of the heathen; heathenism', and (*b*) 'Heathendom, the heathen world; the lands outside Christendom, including, in Middle English, Mohammedan lands'. The first meaning does not apply to an inanimate object such as a book. The second is illustrated in Bosworth-Toller by the words of Ælfred's dedication, in the *NED* by early Middle English examples. . . . No passage is cited which could be used to justify the interpretation of Westwood and Zimmermann. The natural assumption, therefore, is that Aldormon Ælfred discovered the book during an expedition into pagan territory, that is, into the Anglian kingdoms north of the Thames.

[1] Though he sometimes assumes or implies it, I do not know where Zimmermann examines and establishes this general proposition, which is improbable because the Anglo-Saxon Church as organized by Theodore (d. 690) did not consist of a number of 'centres' sealed off from one another. Against a single centre for the five MSS., I cited Kendrick and Lowe, and Westwood before them. Lowe has apposite comments in *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vi (1953), p. xix, on another of Zimmermann's local groups assigned to Fleury.

I said that he 'reported Bosworth-Toller inaccurately', and the reply is that he did 'not misrepresent the Bosworth-Toller Supplement' (above, p. 365). In fact both the definitions come from *N.E.D.*, which gives no Old English example for the second. Bosworth-Toller does not give meanings for Middle English. In the main work, where our passage is missed, the only definition is 'heathenism', 'paganism'. In the Supplement Toller adds more examples with the definition 'paganism', and devotes a special sense-division to our passage, defining: 'people among whom (or district in which) heathenism prevails'. Since the Codex was bought for Canterbury Cathedral from heathen Danish invaders (*æt haeðnum herge*), Toller's preferred definition is against Dr. Kuhn's interpretation and favours that of Westwood, Zimmermann, and the modern editors.[1]

With that I must be content to leave the many differences that remain between us, for which I accept Dr. Kuhn's explanation (above p. 363) that our methods of handling evidence are altogether different.

[1] Sweet, who edited it twice, in his *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* gives '*collectively*, heathens'; in his *Anglo-Saxon Reader* he glosses 'heathendom, heathens', which the present editor, Dr. Onions, accepts (13th edn., 1954). Dr. Harmer, *Select English Historical Documents* (Cambridge, 1914), p. 46, translates 'in heathen hands'. Professor Whitelock, *English Historical Documents*, i (1955), p. 497, has 'in heathen possession'. The abstract *hæþennes* can develop the sense 'heathen people' as naturally as the sense 'heathen territory': *heathendom* and *heathenry* show the development. That the absence of a meaning in Middle English is evidence against its existence in Old English is a novel principle in lexicography.

DANIEL'S REVISION OF HIS *CLEOPATRA*

By Ernest Schanzer

EVER since, some fifty years ago, R. H. Case conjectured that Daniel's revision of his *Cleopatra* was prompted by his having seen a performance of Shakespeare's play, scholars have been reiterating this view with varying degrees of assurance. Case himself put forward his conjecture with some caution. After citing a number of verbal parallels between *Antony and Cleopatra* and the added matter in Daniel's revised play, he writes:

> The question rests on the parallels just given, the introduction of events from Plutarch treated also in certain scenes of *Antony and Cleopatra*, and the remodelling of the play in a more dramatic form; and though this evidence is by no means overwhelming, so far as it goes it is consistent with a hypothesis that Daniel rewrote his play because he had seen another treatment of the theme, namely, Shakespeare's, and just so much probability follows that we should finally exclude 1608 in considering the date of *Antony and Cleopatra*, and admit 1606 to competition with 1607.[1]

Sir Edmund Chambers, in discussing the problem, expresses himself with greater assurance:

> In 1607 Samuel Daniel issued a new edition of his *Certain Small Workes*, and herein made considerable changes in his *Cleopatra* of 1594. These, as carefully analysed by Case, seem to me clearly to show the influence of Shakespeare's play. There are some parallels of idea and phrase. Dialogue often replaces narrative or soliloquy. Dircetus and Diomedes are introduced for the first time. Charmian, Iras, and Gallus are elaborated. A new scene relates, through the mouth of Dircetus, events leading up to the death of Antony, as given by Shakespeare.[2]

In Dr. Dover Wilson's edition of *Antony and Cleopatra* Case's hypothesis is accepted as a certainty:

> R. H. Case has clearly shown that Daniel remodelled his play in the light of Shakespeare's, and since this remodelled edition was published some time in 1607, it follows that *Antony and Cleopatra* must have been first performed either towards the end of 1606 or early enough in 1607 to give Daniel time for the rewriting and printing involved.[3]

[1] Arden edition of *Antony and Cleopatra* (London, 1906), pp. xi–xii.
[2] *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1930), i. 477.
[3] New Shakespeare edition of *Antony and Cleopatra* (Cambridge, 1950), p. ix.

Professor Willard Farnham, writing at about the same time, shows greater caution:

> The possibility that Daniel did his 1607 recasting of *Cleopatra* under the influence of *Antony and Cleopatra*, after seeing it on the stage, is good enough to be one of the reasons why 1607 is taken as an acceptable date for Shakespeare's play. It may be that Daniel provides the instructive spectacle of a scorner of 'Grosse Barbarisme' unwittingly lending a modicum of aid to it and then being corrupted by what he has helped it to achieve.[1]

In the most recent discussion of the problem, that by Messrs. Michel and Seronsy, the authors conclude that Daniel

> may have derived suggestions from Shakespeare for introducing the second and final scenes of his new version, that the recasting of three scenes from narrated action to dramatic representation was probably influenced by the popular drama, but that these recast scenes show Daniel continuing to work in a manner independent of all sources real or supposed. If he borrowed from Shakespeare—and the suspicion that he did so is strong—he showed great resourcefulness in concealing his obligation.[2]

It is remarkable that none of these scholars should have found it necessary to study Daniel's revision in relation to the play which the poet avowed to have been the only begetter of his *Cleopatra*, the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonius*. Had they done so they would have found that most of the additions supposed to be inspired by Shakespeare's play are far more closely paralleled in *Antonius*, and that there can be no doubt that it was this play rather than Shakespeare's that furnished Daniel with suggestions and much of the material for his revision.

The first scene of the revised *Cleopatra* consists merely of a recasting of the fourth act in the earlier versions, with the addition of a few brief speeches for the tutor, Rhodon, and a speech for Caesarion. Nothing in Shakespeare or Plutarch could have suggested these changes. In *Antonius*, Act v, Cleopatra's leave-taking from her children with their tutor is similarly staged and may have furnished the suggestion for the recasting.

The second scene of Act I, in which Dircetus relates the death of Antony, is the one major addition to the play, and here Daniel follows step by step Dircetus's speech in *Antonius*, adding to it only Antony's last words to Cleopatra, which are taken from Plutarch. Shakespeare's Dercetas speaks only a few words, since what he relates at length in the other two plays has been already staged in earlier scenes of *Antony and Cleopatra*.

In an article in *Shakespeare Survey 6* (1953) Mrs. Joan Rees points to

[1] *Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1950), p. 158.

[2] L. Michel and C. C. Seronsy, 'Shakespeare's History Plays and Daniel', *S.P.*, lii (1955), 575.

the precise visual details and the dramatic quality of Dircetus's description of how Antony was hoisted into the monument, and suggests that they are based on Daniel's memories of a stage-performance of *Antony and Cleopatra*. She, too, ignores the Countess of Pembroke's play as a possible influence, but remarks:

> These points, curious as they are, may, of course, all be explained as the result of a working over of Plutarch by Daniel with the intention of adding 'corroborative detail' to the narrative. If this is the proper explanation, then we must claim for Daniel a sense of scene and drama not often acknowledged as his. (p. 93)

A glance at the corresponding passage in *Antonius* makes clear that it was this which served as Daniel's model for the description. Though it contains no mention of 'rowles of taffaty' or of Charmian and Eras tugging at the pulley, it is marked by precisely the same 'sense of scene and drama', the same vivid visual details, including a description of Daniel's 'vnderlookers, which there gazing stood', of whom there is no mention in Plutarch or Shakespeare.

> Little and little *Antony* was pull'd,
> Now breathing death: his beard was all vnkempt,
> His face and brest al bathed in his bloud.
> So hideous yet, and dieng as he was,
> His eies half-clos'd vppon the Queene he cast:
> Held vp his hands, and holpe himselfe to raise,
> But still with weakness back his bodie fell.
> The miserable ladie with moist eies,
> With haire which careles on hir forhead hong,
> With brest which blowes had bloudily benumb'd,
> With stooping head, and body down-ward bent,
> Enlast hir in the corde, and with all force
> This life-dead man couragiously vprais'd,
> The bloud with paine into hir face did flowe,
> Hir sinewes stiff, her selfe did breathles grow.
> The people which beneath in flocks beheld,
> Assisted her with gesture, speach, desire:
> Cride and incourag'd her, and in their soules
> Did sweate, and labor, no whit lesse then she.
> Who neuer tir'd in labor, held so long
> Helpt by her women, and hir constant heart,
> That *Antony* was drawne into the tombe,
> And there (I thinke) of dead augments the summe.
> (*Antonius*, F5^{v}–F6)[1]

One other small point indicates that in writing this scene Daniel closely

[1] I quote throughout from the 1595 edition of the play.

followed the corresponding passages in *Antonius*. He makes Octavius express his fear that Cleopatra should

> fire the treasure which she hath amast
> Within that vault, of all the precious stuffe
> That Egypt yields, and disappoint at last
> Our trauels of the benefit thereof. (I. ii. 305–8)[1]

In *Antonius* this is expressed by Agrippa at the same point in the scene:

> But best we sought into the tombe to get,
> Lest she consume in this amazed case
> So much rich treasure, with which happely
> Despaire in death may make hir feede the fire:
> Suffring the flames hir Iewells to deface,
> You to defraud, hir funerall to grace. ($F7$–$F7^{v}$)

Shakespeare depicts Caesar as indifferent to Cleopatra's treasure, while Plutarch at this point merely says that Caesar

> sent Proculeius, and commanded him to do what he could possible to get Cleopatra alive, fearing lest otherwise all the treasure would be lost.[2]

In the next scene, II. i, Charmian and Eras have been added to what was in the earlier versions one of Cleopatra's soliloquies. They try to comfort the Queen and to persuade her to come to terms with Caesar, but Cleopatra remains unmoved in her decision to die. There is nothing in Plutarch or Shakespeare to have suggested this debate, but *Antonius*, Act II, contains a very similar scene in which Cleopatra expresses her determination to follow Antony in death, while Charmian and Eras, in stichomythic passages akin to Daniel's, try to persuade her to live.

The next major alteration is found in Act IV, Scene ii, where the anonymous *Nuntius* of the earlier versions has been turned into Diomedes, and Cleopatra's speech, previously related by the *Nuntius*, is enacted in a slightly shortened and revised form. In *Antony and Cleopatra* Diomedes is a much less prominent character than in *Antonius*, where he is given a soliloquy of over fifty lines ($C5^{v}$–$C7$). In both these plays he appears only once, as Cleopatra's messenger to Antony, and neither they nor Plutarch could have suggested to Daniel his identification of Diomedes with the countryman who brings the asps in the basket of figs. Charmian and Eras have also been added to the scene, and Eras calls upon Cleopatra to have hope in the future, but is again rebutted by the Queen. Similarly, in

[1] Quotations are taken from the 1611 edition, as reprinted by M. Lederer in vol. xxxi of *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas* (Louvain, 1911).

[2] *Shakespeare's Plutarch*, ed. Tucker Brooke (London, 1909), ii. 124.

Antonius, Act II, Charmian unavailingly urges Cleopatra to 'alwaies hope the best, euen to the last, / That from our selues the mischiefe may not grow' (C1ᵛ).

Finally, in the last scene of his revised play Daniel stages what in the earlier versions had been narrated by the *Nuntius*: his delivery of the asps and Cleopatra's suicide, followed by that of Eras and Charmian. For this there is no model in *Antonius*, and here those who claim that Daniel's revision was influenced by Shakespeare's play may seem at last to have some basis for their belief. But once Daniel had decided to stage the *Nuntius's* narrative, as part of a general plan to make the play more suitable for stage presentation, it is difficult to see what other form the scene could have taken. Nowhere is there any echo of Shakespeare's great closing scene, either in language, characterization, or dramatic situation, beyond what stems from their common use of Plutarch as their source. The countryman is utterly unlike Shakespeare's, being merely Diomedes in rustic disguise. Most of the lines in the scene are taken from the *Nuntius's* speech in the earlier versions, and for the few lines that are newly added, Cleopatra's repeated demand of Eras whether she can yet see Diomedes approaching, no suggestion is found in Shakespeare's play.

We have seen, then, that Daniel modelled the changes in his play for the most part on the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonius*, and that there is nowhere any indication of the influence of *Antony and Cleopatra* upon the choice of new characters, the thoughts they express, or the dramatic situations in which they are placed. What, then, of Case's remaining point, the verbal parallels between the additions to *Cleopatra* and Shakespeare's play? None of the parallels adduced by Case himself seem to me carry much weight, if any. But there are others which strongly suggest indebtedness one way or the other. Michel and Seronsy have pointed out that Daniel's

> And none about *Octauius* trust, said hee,
> But *Proculeius* he's an honest man (I. ii. 280–1)

is much closer to Shakespeare's 'None about *Caesar* trust, but *Proculeius*' (IV. xv. 64) than Plutarch's 'that chiefly she should trust Proculeius above any man else about Caesar'.[1] To this may be added two hitherto unnoticed parallels. Firstly, that between Caesar's 'Rise madame, rise, your selfe was cause of all' in the revised *Cleopatra* (III. ii. 919) and his 'I pray you, rise, rise Egypt' in Shakespeare's play (V. ii. 141). (The parallel is less close in the earlier versions of *Cleopatra*, which have 'Rise, Queene, none but thy self is cause of all'.) Secondly, there is the 'teaching' metaphor, used

[1] Loc. cit., p. 576.

in both plays by Antony on hearing of the Queen's supposed suicide. In *Cleopatra* Antonius exclaims,

> what? and hast thou then
> Preuented me, braue Queene, by thy great worth
> Hath *Cleopatra* taught the worke of men?
> . . . doth she disappoint
> Me, of th'example to teach her to die? (I. ii. 206–12)

Shakespeare's Antony plays variations on the same metaphor.

> My Queene and *Eros*
> Haue by their braue instructions got vpon me
> A Noblenesse in Record. . . . Come then, and *Eros*,
> Thy Master dies thy Scholler; to do thus
> I learnt of thee. (IV. xiv. 117–23)

Those who maintain that in all these instances Daniel was the borrower have to explain how any man, much less a poet of Daniel's ability, could see a performance of *Antony and Cleopatra* and then, in revising his play on the same subject, borrow from it only a few paltry expressions. On the other hand, for Shakespeare to have picked up these verbal crumbs would have been quite natural, since there is little in Daniel's play to have fired his imagination. It is, therefore, far more reasonable to assume that Shakespeare, after having read *Cleopatra* in one of the earlier versions, also skimmed through the added material in the revised form of the play. That Shakespeare had also read the play in one of the earlier versions is indicated by echoes of passages which were omitted in the revision, especially the Cydnus allusion in Act V, and the mention in the same scene of how the dying Cleopatra 'wryes the Diademe which on her head she wore' (V. ii. 1652).[1]

But if it was not the impact of seeing a performance of Shakespeare's play, what was it that prompted Daniel's radical revision of his *Cleopatra*? The right answer seems to me that given some twenty years ago by Johannes Schütze in an undeservedly neglected article on 'Daniel's *Cleo-*

[1] Dover Wilson's other chief piece of evidence in support of his contention that '*Antony and Cleopatra* had been known to London audiences for at least a year, if not sixteen months, before May 1608' (op. cit., p. viii) are the supposed echoes of the play in Barnabe Barnes's *The Devil's Charter*. But the only parallel not found in Plutarch, the notion that Cleopatra applied the asps to her breast rather than her arms, did not originate with Shakespeare, as Wilson's own note to V. ii. 308 (ibid., p. 243), with its quotation from Nashe, alone makes clear. We are thus left without any real evidence that *Antony and Cleopatra* was written before the spring of 1608. And if my conjectures about Shakespeare's borrowings from Daniel are correct, it was not written until after the publication, some time in 1607, of the revised edition of *Cleopatra*.

patra und Shakespeare'.[1] He points out that in *The Apology* affixed to *Philotas* Daniel speaks of his being

> driuen by necessity to make vse of my pen, and the Stage to bee the mouth of my lines, which before were neuer heard to speake, but in silence.[2]

The same financial necessity, Mr. Schütze argues, drove the poet some three years later to make his *Cleopatra* more suitable for the theatre, with the hope that like *Philotas* it would be performed on the stage. (According to Chambers, 'The Apology is fixed by its own date to the autumn of 1604, and the performance was pretty clearly by the Queen's Revels in the same year.'[3])

Once this view of the reason for the revision is taken, the nature of the changes is understandable enough. As long as he had intended his play to be read as a companion-piece to the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonius*, Daniel had been careful not to duplicate incidents and dramatic situations found in that play. But in the revised version, intended for the stage rather than the study, and for an audience unlikely, for the most part, to be acquainted with the Countess's play, Daniel, we may presume, felt free to take over from it incidents, situations, and characters, in order to increase, however slightly to modern eyes, his play's viability on the stage.

[1] *Englische Studien*, lxxi (1936), 58–72. It had earlier been briefly suggested by Kastner and Charlton in *The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander* (Manchester, 1921), I. clxxxi, n. 1.

[2] Daniel, *Complete Works*, ed. Grosart (London, 1885), iii. 179.

[3] *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), iii. 276.

MARVELL AND THE NEW CRITICS[1]

By Pierre Legouis

WHEN our secretary asked me to read a paper before this conference it was suggested that the title might run: 'Second thoughts on Marvell.' But upon examination the dreadful reality revealed itself starkly to me: I had *no* second thoughts on Marvell, at least not on his poetry. Since my bulky book came out in 1928 I have had to revise my views on his wife, or rather non-wife. And by discovering his presence at Saumur in 1656 Mrs. Duncan-Jones has opened to me new vistas on the religious thought of his later years. As an historian I should have liked to give you today a picture of that small French town, then at the height of its intellectual fame. But this could hardly have led to a discussion, and discussion is what the organizers of the conference are after. Do not blame *me* then if this paper adopts a provocative, nay an aggressive, tone and roundly attacks all those who have presumed, in the last twenty-eight years, to discover new meanings in Marvell's poems. For I shall use the term 'new criticism' in a very inclusive sense, regardless of the division of opinion between schools or coteries, English and American, even confounding Cantabs with Oxonians. Whether they like it or not, to an impartial and sufficiently remote observer they all derive from Professor Empson's *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930). Further than that in their pedigree I will not go. The philosophical and psychological basis for their method I shall ignore. Were I a blunt Englishman I should say I neither know nor care whence it originates. By their fruit I will know them. Have they brought forth any interpretation, both new and valid, of any poem, stanza, or line?

Though in his afore-mentioned book Mr. Empson discussed several poems of Marvell's and performed some remarkable feats with them, his main contribution to the Marvellian new look is the article on 'The Garden' published in *Scrutiny*, i (1932). Indeed 'The Garden' has since been the most frequently re-examined of Marvell's poems; and, my time being limited, I shall concentrate on it almost exclusively.

Here is a sample of Mr. Empson's method. Stanza vi, as you know, opens:

> Meanwhile the Mind, from pleasure less,
> Withdraws into its happiness;

[1] This paper was read at the Third Triennial Conference of the International Association of University Professors of English at Cambridge in August 1956. It has been left practically unaltered.

From pleasure less. Either 'from the lessening of pleasure . . .' or 'made less by pleasure . . .'. Since three meanings, in Mr. Empson's theory, are better than two, his omission of the real meaning conclusively shows that he never saw it: 'from a pleasure that is inferior' (see *O.E.D.* under *Less*, 2), viz. sensuous pleasure, the mind withdraws into a happiness that is specifically its own, viz. contemplation. Here Mr. Empson does exactly what many a bright student has been doing for the last thirty-four years in translations set by me: not seeing the obvious meaning of a phrase and seeing entirely improbable ones instead, *gallice* 'faire un contre-sens'. So that, to parody a regal remark, we are amused, but we are not impressed.

However, Mr. Empson does not stop *en si beau chemin*, but proceeds with the next couplet:

> The mind that Ocean where each kind
> Does streight its own resemblance find;

Here my friend Margoliouth's standard edition provides him with the true meaning, in the form of a quotation from *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, to which I have added one from Butler and this from Cleveland:

> Some have affirm'd that what on earth we find
> The sea can parallel for shape and kind.

But, in order to form one of his beloved dyads, Mr. Empson remarks that the sea also is a conscious mirror, and 'if calm reflects everything'. I answer, with gross literalness, that the sea will not reflect 'each kind' (of animals or plants) unless you previously hang them above it, a process involving even more difficulties than Noah was faced with when called upon to build the Ark. Such a vagary as Mr. Empson's, forgivable only in a reader reduced to his twentieth-century knowledge, or ignorance, of natural history, is here positively harmful, since it distracts the mind (our mind) from the historical meaning, the only one that Marvell meant, the obvious one for mid-seventeenth-century men.

It was to be expected that a religious and a sexual ambiguity, or a religiously-sexual, or a sexually-religious, ambiguity should be extracted from some part of the poem. The stanza selected for this treatment is the fifth, and especially its final couplet:

> Stumbling on Melons, as I pass,
> Insnared with Flow'rs, I fall on grass.

Mr. Empson wonders whether admiring readers 'have recognized that the *A* and *Ω* of the stanza are the Apple and the Fall', since 'Melon . . . is Greek for apple'. Indeed *I* had not. Nor had I noticed that the stanza 'is the triumph of Marvell's attempt to impose a sexual interest upon Nature'. I had fondly imagined, so far, that the poet had left, for a time at least, the

MARVELL AND THE NEW CRITICS[1]

By Pierre Legouis

WHEN our secretary asked me to read a paper before this conference it was suggested that the title might run: 'Second thoughts on Marvell.' But upon examination the dreadful reality revealed itself starkly to me: I had *no* second thoughts on Marvell, at least not on his poetry. Since my bulky book came out in 1928 I have had to revise my views on his wife, or rather non-wife. And by discovering his presence at Saumur in 1656 Mrs. Duncan-Jones has opened to me new vistas on the religious thought of his later years. As an historian I should have liked to give you today a picture of that small French town, then at the height of its intellectual fame. But this could hardly have led to a discussion, and discussion is what the organizers of the conference are after. Do not blame *me* then if this paper adopts a provocative, nay an aggressive, tone and roundly attacks all those who have presumed, in the last twenty-eight years, to discover new meanings in Marvell's poems. For I shall use the term 'new criticism' in a very inclusive sense, regardless of the division of opinion between schools or coteries, English and American, even confounding Cantabs with Oxonians. Whether they like it or not, to an impartial and sufficiently remote observer they all derive from Professor Empson's *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (1930). Further than that in their pedigree I will not go. The philosophical and psychological basis for their method I shall ignore. Were I a blunt Englishman I should say I neither know nor care whence it originates. By their fruit I will know them. Have they brought forth any interpretation, both new and valid, of any poem, stanza, or line?

Though in his afore-mentioned book Mr. Empson discussed several poems of Marvell's and performed some remarkable feats with them, his main contribution to the Marvellian new look is the article on 'The Garden' published in *Scrutiny*, i (1932). Indeed 'The Garden' has since been the most frequently re-examined of Marvell's poems; and, my time being limited, I shall concentrate on it almost exclusively.

Here is a sample of Mr. Empson's method. Stanza vi, as you know, opens:

> Meanwhile the Mind, from pleasure less,
> Withdraws into its happiness;

[1] This paper was read at the Third Triennial Conference of the International Association of University Professors of English at Cambridge in August 1956. It has been left practically unaltered.

From pleasure less. Either 'from the lessening of pleasure . . .' or 'made less by pleasure . . .'. Since three meanings, in Mr. Empson's theory, are better than two, his omission of the real meaning conclusively shows that he never saw it: 'from a pleasure that is inferior' (see *O.E.D.* under *Less*, 2), viz. sensuous pleasure, the mind withdraws into a happiness that is specifically its own, viz. contemplation. Here Mr. Empson does exactly what many a bright student has been doing for the last thirty-four years in translations set by me: not seeing the obvious meaning of a phrase and seeing entirely improbable ones instead, *gallice* 'faire un contre-sens'. So that, to parody a regal remark, we are amused, but we are not impressed.

However, Mr. Empson does not stop *en si beau chemin*, but proceeds with the next couplet:

> The mind that Ocean where each kind
> Does streight its own resemblance find;

Here my friend Margoliouth's standard edition provides him with the true meaning, in the form of a quotation from *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, to which I have added one from Butler and this from Cleveland:

> Some have affirm'd that what on earth we find
> The sea can parallel for shape and kind.

But, in order to form one of his beloved dyads, Mr. Empson remarks that the sea also is a conscious mirror, and 'if calm reflects everything'. I answer, with gross literalness, that the sea will not reflect 'each kind' (of animals or plants) unless you previously hang them above it, a process involving even more difficulties than Noah was faced with when called upon to build the Ark. Such a vagary as Mr. Empson's, forgivable only in a reader reduced to his twentieth-century knowledge, or ignorance, of natural history, is here positively harmful, since it distracts the mind (our mind) from the historical meaning, the only one that Marvell meant, the obvious one for mid-seventeenth-century men.

It was to be expected that a religious and a sexual ambiguity, or a religiously-sexual, or a sexually-religious, ambiguity should be extracted from some part of the poem. The stanza selected for this treatment is the fifth, and especially its final couplet:

> Stumbling on Melons, as I pass,
> Insnared with Flow'rs, I fall on grass.

Mr. Empson wonders whether admiring readers 'have recognized that the *A* and *Ω* of the stanza are the Apple and the Fall', since 'Melon . . . is Greek for apple'. Indeed *I* had not. Nor had I noticed that the stanza 'is the triumph of Marvell's attempt to impose a sexual interest upon Nature'. I had fondly imagined, so far, that the poet had left, for a time at least, the

'sexual interest' behind him, in London Cavalier society, and explicitly sacrificed women to trees in stanzas iii and iv. But now I am quite prepared to reconsider these 'Melons' in a new light. Only I must ask myself why Marvell also placed them (erroneously or not) on the soil of the Bermudas: is it to 'ensnare' the Greekless Puritan emigrants who foolishly thank God for them? He 'throws the Melons at our feet'. Indeed I wonder why nobody has yet (to my knowledge) given a psychoanalytic explanation of these 'melons': in Greek they are apples, Mr. Empson reminds us, and in French 'pommes' is sometimes applied, in a very informal style, to those globular charms that have made Marilyn Monroe and Gina Lollobrigida famous in our time. As a result no doubt of repression, the English Puritans, probably in a dream, find these instruments of the Fall of Man enticing them to 'fall on grass'.

If you say I exaggerate I shall refer you to the next full-scale commentary on 'The Garden', a much ampler one than Mr. Empson's. Mr. Milton Klonsky apparently has a full right to the title of 'new critic', since his article 'A Guide through *The Garden*' appeared in the *Sewanee Review*, lviii (1950). He adopts a good many interpretations from Mr. Empson, particularly that of the melons being the forbidden fruit, and Marvell's fall on the grass 'a corruptive action'. The 'ripe round feminine forms' are, moreover, recognized, not only in the Greek melons and the English apples, but also in the peaches (possibly with an anticipation of the American 'she is a peach'), the nectarines, and even the grape. As an inevitable consequence 'the sensuality which had been steadily rising up to now is climactically discharged', whatever this may mean.

But Mr. Klonsky's article is not all fun. He has warned us in his preamble that the poem could be thoroughly understood only through the study of Plotinus' *Enneads*. I have no *a priori* objection to such an approach, provided the obvious sense of the poem suffers no distortion, but this is just what befalls it here. Mr. Klonsky wants to prove that Marvell—or Marvell's 'protagonist' as he curiously calls him—is guilty of 'sensuality', and he punishes, or cures, him with death, the result of which appears in stanza vi, already quoted. Now, says Mr. Klonsky, 'the soul and the body are dissevered'. They are, in a way, since the mind cuts itself off from sensation, but why obtrude death here? And, what is even worse, why introduce an idea of guilt where the poem gives a happy gradation from the inferior (less) but quite legitimate pleasure of a vegetable life, to the higher pleasure of contemplation, itself only a step to the ecstasy in the next stanza? Mr. Klonsky's introduction of guilt is, to use his own phrase, 'a corruptive action'.

I must now go back a dozen years or so and say a word of the useful 'Notes' on 'The Garden' contributed by Mr. A. H. King to *English Studies*

in 1938. But should he rank among the new critics except in point of date? His careful examination of the English text in connexion with the Latin one satisfies the rules of caution laid down by the old criticism at almost every point. If he refers to Mr. Empson's Apple-and-Fall interpretation he tones it down considerably. On the other hand I agree with him that in 'The Garden' Marvell's 'approach should be kept distinct from the mortally earnest approach to Nature of a Romantic poet like Shelley' (indeed I had said so in my book)—but I disagree with the epithet 'mincing' applied by Mr. King to Marvell's 'approach': as if there were no other choice than that between Romanticism and effeminacy. I should rather say that the Romantic poets lack a certain form of *pudor*, which Marvell has, while he can be serious enough under the surface. And against Mr. King's restrictive criticism of 'a green thought in a green shade' I must protest, because he takes up a remark of mine (in a footnote) that 'green' can mean 'naïve' and regrets my 'building nothing on this'. I shall retort that *he* builds more than the remark will bear, for, as I had been careful to say, the usual senses of green, including this one, prove inadequate here, and there is mystery in the phrase.

An even more detailed study than Mr. Klonsky's followed closely. It was no less 'new' since it appeared in *Essays in Criticism*, ii (1952). It bears the title 'The Argument of Marvell's *Garden*'. With its author, Mr. Frank Kermode, I often agree, all the more readily since he rather confirms (tacitly) than contradicts what I had said of yore. If I have a complaint against him, it is that he goes too far in the right direction, e.g. when he dismisses autobiographical interpretation. Attention paid to the genre, however profitable, does not constitute the sum total of criticism, and Mr. Kermode rather overworks the notion. The terms 'genre' and 'species' are relative, as we learnt at school; but while the seventeenth century acknowledged the pastoral as a genre it would not have recognized the genre of 'garden poetry' as defined by Mr. Kermode. Even today the more modest term 'theme' might prove more suitable here.

Anyhow, in the so-called genre, poems by Théophile and Saint-Amant are included. Of course, as early as 1930, Mr. Geoffrey Woledge had called attention to them in connexion with Lord Fairfax and his daughter's tutor, and had said they were in the same 'tradition'. Miss Bradbrook, in 1941, had considerably enlarged the claim on behalf of the French *libertins*, and Miss Ruth Wallerstein had followed suit in 1950. These three critics had chiefly stressed the literary resemblances between Marvell and his French predecessors. I must say I remained somewhat sceptical, because when preparing my book I had read these poets and been struck more by the differences, still literary, between them and Marvell, who, by the way, could not scan a French line though he could read French prose easily

enough. But I would not refuse the honour paid to my country and kept silent. Now Mr. Kermode, curtly dismissing his English or American predecessors, stresses the sufficiently obvious moral differences between Marvell and Saint-Amant or Théophile, and sets out to prove that Marvell wrote to contradict, or to refute, them in the same style. Mr. Kermode even erects 'The Garden' into an 'anti-genre'. Here I must come in and, paradoxically for a Frenchman, accuse an Englishman of too systematic a treatment of the problem. There is little polemical spirit in 'The Garden'. The only satiric touch, the word 'fond' applied to male lovers, denotes smiling intellectual superiority rather than moral reprobation. Neither are the ladies at all severely handled: their 'white or red' (natural it seems) is indeed placed lower than the 'lovely green' of the plants, but, as the Latin version testifies, Marvell grants them a very moving beauty: 'Vergineae quem non suspendit gratia formae?' They surpass the snow in whiteness and the purple in redness—only the green stands in a class by itself. But here again Mr. Kermode reacts against his predecessors—except Mr. King—this time by denying that there is anything special in this word 'green'. He calls the 'green thought' the 'great bogey'. This seems to me to be carrying to excess the reaction against such philosophizing and scholasticizing of the epithet as Miss Wallerstein's. Certainly the thought is green because the solitude is green, but does it really end there?

To prove that he is a 'new critic' *stricto sensu* in spite of his fondness for genre, Mr. Kermode pronounces it evident that Empson and King were right to find in stanza v 'a direct allusion to the Fall' and dilates on the 'famous ambiguity' in the beginning of stanza vi: 'from pleasure less'. He indeed admits the only sensible interpretation (omitted by Mr. Empson) but he does so in a half-hearted and shamefaced manner. Yet his conclusion on the passage tallies with mine: 'the Platonism is here dilute and current'. I had spoken, apropos of 'A Drop of Dew', but with general application to Marvell's poetry, of 'platonisme diffus'. However, when he comes to stanza vii, Mr. Kermode, still in virtue of his system, unduly lessens Marvell's originality. To the lines

> Casting the bodies vest aside
> My soul into the boughs does glide:
> There like a Bird it sits and sings,

he discovers many parallels. But they entirely fail—in particular those culled by him in Saint-Amant and Théophile fail—to give the impression of the poet's identification with Nature that Marvell's metaphor gives, and here resides the unique value of that moment. For, while no one could deny the allusion to heaven in the last line but one, 'till prepared for longer flight', it sounds rather perfunctory. Marvell certainly wants to go to a still

better place some day, but no less certainly he does not want to go yet. He is fully satisfied with a condition very similar to that described in a famous passage of 'Upon Appleton House', where he talks with the birds 'in their most learned original'. His past belongs to Woman, his future to God, but his present belongs to Nature alone. And at the risk of shocking religious souls, I consider that the premature intrusion of God into Mr. Kermode's commentary spoils the instant. Truth to say, Marvell himself does not remain thus poised, and the next stanza, the eighth, cannot but come as an anticlimax with its reference—a playful one—to the earthly Paradise. Yet, says Mr. Kermode, it clinches the 'Argument'; here Marvell 'at last makes [his] theme explicit' and confounds the *libertins* by stating that the right sort of solitude 'can only exist in the absence of women, the agents of the most powerful voluptuous temptation'. But surely Eve is not Adam's mistress in either sense of the word: she is his wedded wife (Marvell says 'mate') and the poet does not here renounce love but marriage. We now know for certain, thanks to Professor F. S. Tupper, that the man Marvell stuck to the last by the wisdom then revealed to him. He remained so far a hedonist that he never married. As his eighteenth-century editor, Captain Thompson, R.N., put it for all time: 'He had no wife and his gallantries are not known.'

Passing to the second most written-about of Marvell's poems, the 'Horatian Ode', I must say at once that the new criticism has dealt with it far less recklessly, beginning with Professor Cleanth Brooks in *English Institute Essays 1946*. Though professedly an attack on the mere historians of literature, this study takes history into account very largely. No flagrant distortion of the meaning is indulged in. In fact Mr. Brooks proceeds so dexterously and by such delicate touches that one has to keep a wary eye on him in order to see where he deviates from the high road of criticism. This is what I should call in French 'la méthode des petits coups de pouce répétés'. His suggestions of ambiguity at least achieve a plausibility far above Mr. Empson's. Yet the general unfairness to Cromwell with which Professor Bush has charged Mr. Brooks appears in the end, though he has denied it in his rejoinder. Substantially I agree with Mr. Bush, who mostly (so at least it seems to me) elaborated in 1952 the judgement on the 'Ode' passed by me in 1928. But I have a personal statement to make in answer to a remark by Mr. Brooks. He takes exception to my calling the 'Ode' 'ce monument d'indifférence en matière de régime politique'. Probably he has failed to see the allusion to a French pamphlet that caused some stir under the *Restauration*: the *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion*, by the then Abbé de La Mennais. This was an attack, not mainly on the lack of interest in religion but on the belief that several religions, or forms of the Christian religion, were much on a par, and an honest man might

choose among them according to circumstances. Mr. Brooks can well be excused for missing this point, but he certainly knows a poem of Donne's, 'The Indifferent', far remote from La Mennais's four-volume pamphlet in every respect save the meaning of 'indifference'. It begins: 'I can love both fair and brown'. This does not mean that Donne loves neither fair nor brown, does it? So that for me 'monument d'indifference' was but a stronger and more conceited way of saying 'monument of impartiality', a phrase Mr. Brooks seems to accept—though indeed I should not call *his* article itself monumentally impartial.

I thought I had done with the 'Horatian Ode' when I came across Mr. L. D. Lerner's large-scale study of it in *Interpretations*, a volume of essays by divers hands published last year. This one decidedly makes its author a disciple of Mr. Empson, even though he dares to question the master's classification of ambiguities. Empson is the only critic named, and one ambiguity, tentatively proposed in Margoliouth's edition on 'the Axes edge' and the Latin *acies* (eyesight and blade) is credited by Mr. Lerner to Mr. Empson: 'on ne prête qu'aux riches'. Mr. Lerner himself proves quite equal to the task of discovering ambiguities, which evince great ingeniousness, or over-ingeniousness. The Marxist quality ascribed to the 'Ode' is, transparently, an evaporation of wit on Mr. Lerner's part. But I fear he speaks seriously when the lines

> 'Tis Madness to resist or blame
> The force of angry Heavens flame

call forth this comment: 'gone is the Horatian mode, we have the utter conviction of the inspired Puritan', in this 'almost hysterical' couplet. Surely Marvell, if a Puritan, is not that sort of Puritan, and classical antiquity, from Homer onwards, would provide such maxims, not exactly hysterical, on the madness of resisting angry Heaven. Yet the poem as a whole comes out of Mr. Lerner's hands practically unharmed. If he solves no mystery, the reason may well be that there was no mystery to solve. In 'Tom May's Death', written at least six months after the 'Ode', lies the real biographical mystery, bequeathed by me to my successors. They have not tackled it yet.

I have said elsewhere[1] what I thought of recent interpretations of 'The Nymph complaining for the death of her Fawn', but I should like to say here a few words on 'To his Coy Mistress'; not to retract what I wrote in 1928, but to mention an article in *Modern Philology*, li (1953–4), in which Mr. J. V. Cunningham uses this acknowledged verse-syllogism to uphold the doctrine that the principal structure of a poem may be—and according to him should be—logical. This Chicago Aristotelian would feel insulted

[1] In *Études anglaises*, viii (1955), 111–12.

if I called him a 'new critic', but I mean no harm by including him here: his antique logic satisfies my own misoneism, and I only demur at his explanation of 'vegetable love'. According to him the uninitiated, including Mr. T. S. Eliot, here 'envisage some monstrous and expanding cabbage', while 'vegetable' is an abstract and philosophical term (which, by the way, Miss Bradbrook had said before him). But surely most of us think not of a cabbage but of the cedar of Lebanon, and such a tree was, I trust, in Marvell's thought, rather than 'the vegetable soul' of the Stagirite, the principle of growth no doubt, yet as an abstraction hardly susceptible of becoming itself 'Vaster than Empires'.

To conclude: we must rejoice to see the growing critical interest in Marvell's best work, even if each newer critic largely destroys what his immediate predecessor has been trying to establish. And we must rejoice even more to see the learned periodicals or bodies, and even private publishers, printing such studies unstintingly, a sure sign that readers are found for views on Marvell and, presumably, for his poetry as well. In the early years of this century the *explication de texte* was one of France's chief exports, but now I fear we are quite out-distanced in this exercise by many British and American critics. Certainly they have made it more spacious, thorough, and minute than anything I know in my mother-tongue. How times change! When my study of Marvell came out, most of the Anglo-Saxon reviewers complained of its pedantic prolixity; even that friendly Scot, Professor (now Sir Herbert) Grierson, thought that it ran into unnecessary detail. I may confess I worried at the time. Now I look at my successors and smile.

TWO FRAGMENTS OF WALSH MANUSCRIPTS

By PHYLLIS FREEMAN

ATTEMPTS have been made in recent years, notably by American scholars,[1] to reassess the value of William Walsh as a critic and a link between the two greatest poets of his age; for it has seemed to them 'a matter of some literary importance to determine why Dryden and Pope so valued Walsh'.[2] The difficulty of such a revaluation lies in the fact that Walsh's was largely—as Voiture's was entirely—a *réclame des coteries*, owing more to the ephemeral exchanges of club and coffee-house than to his slight published work. To those outside such circles it appeared, even in his own day, that Walsh, 'tho' he never writ, / Yet passes for a Critick and a Wit';[3] and since Pope's death the tendency has been to discount the eulogies of Walsh's great contemporaries and to regard him as an amiable literary fop.

During the last twenty years, however, the recovery of two considerable manuscripts[4] of letters and poems by Walsh has done something towards re-establishing his position, not only as a skilful experimenter in verse and a letter-writer of Voiture's quality, but as the 'judicious Walsh'[5] of contemporary renown. Two further holograph fragments by Walsh have now come to light in the British Museum, adding part of a critical essay, a letter to Wycherley, and several poems to his unpublished remains. One of these manuscripts,[6] although ascribed to a Mr. Walsh, escaped attention through being wrongly dated as of some years before Walsh's birth and the other[7] through attribution to Sir Robert Howard.

Harleian MS. 7001, a large collection of miscellaneous letters, contains five leaves from a Walsh manuscript on which are two letters and an

[1] Dale B. Vetter, 'William Walsh's "In Defence of Painting" ', *M.L.N.*, lxvi (1951), 518–23; *The Letters of John Dryden*, ed. Charles Ward (Durham, N.C., 1942); James Osborn, *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems* (New York, 1940).

[2] Vetter, 'The Literary Criticism of William Walsh', *Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations* (Chicago and Evanston, 1947), xiv. 19–23.

[3] Shippen, 'Faction Display'd', *Poems on State Affairs* (London, 1705), p. 578.

[4] Bodleian MS. Malone 9; B.M. Add. MS. 10434.

[5] Codrington, 'Commendatory Verses', Garth's *Dispensary* (London, 1699).

[6] Harl. MS. 7001, ff. 211, 211^{v}, 214–17^{v}, described in MS. index as 'Draughts of letters from Mr. Walsh to Mr. Wycherley, Abberley, 3d. Sept. 1650'.

[7] B.M. Add. MS. 38001; ff. 12, folio; print of Kneller portrait of Sir Robert Howard pasted on f. 2; described in printed catalogue as 'Poems by Sir Robert Howard,' corrected in ink as by Walsh.

R.E.S. New Series, Vol. VIII, No. 32 (1957)

incomplete portion of a critical essay. The first letter, one of gallantry to an unnamed lady, is signed with Walsh's initials, addressed from his Worcestershire home, and dated. It reads:

You may remember Madam y^t^ ye last time I had the honour of seeing you, I told you I was very much in Love. I can assure you I have all ye reason in ye World to believe it true; And y^t^ I may make you Judge in ye case as well as my Self I will tell you w^t^ it is y^t^ induces [mee] to think so. In ye first place I have been in a deep melancholy ever since I saw you; I answer properly to no question y^t^ is asked mee; I eat nothing, drink little & never sleep at all, or if I do slumber a little sometimes 'tis a continual dream of you. All day long I walk alone, with folded arms, downcast look & every twenty steps, lett out a volley of sighes y^t^ wou'd move compassion in Stone Walls; I converse w^th^ nothing by ye Eccho, & with her only because shee is so civil as to repeat yo^r^ name after mee; Tis true Madam having been utterly unacquainted with things of this Nature hitherto, I will not bee positive y^t^ it is Love, but all ye Physitians y^t^ I have consulted will tell mee it can bee nothing else. As there is no body y^t^ I coud catch it of, but your self, so I desire to know whether you have had any such symptoms; for it woud bee very strange indeed y^t^ you shoud infect mee with a distemper y^t^ you are utterly free from yo^r^ Self. Besides Madam they tell me y^t^ this Load of Love w^ch^ is intolerable to bee born upon one bodyes shoulders, yet it is ye prettiest diversion in ye World when tis divided between two; Were it not so I shou'd not desire you shou'd feel it; for tho' I shoud dy if you did not; yet I woud rather do so than it shou'd give you so much disturbance as it does mee. See there Madam how naturally I fall into saying tender things, even before I am aware; so ten to one but I fall into a fit of Poetry ere long. for I finde I have much adoe to express my Self in Prose allready. The greatest Inclination in ye World to call you by some Greek or Roman name; & discover somew^t^ wherein you are very like all ye Gods & Godesses, Sun & Moon & Stars; These things I confess do not appear altogether so well in prose; & I think I do it too much honour when I make use of it to assure you how much I am

Sep: 3: 1690. W. W.[1]
Abberley.

The second letter, unsigned and undated, is addressed 'To Mr. Wycherley' and reads:

Missing the happiness of seeing you ye day before I came out of Town, I sent you a direction by Mr. W— how to write to mee, but least y^t^ shou'd not come to yo^r^ hand, I send this to lett you know where I am; & assure you there is nothing can give mee so much delight here as the promise you made mee, of letting mee hear from you sometimes. Tis true tis an enjoym^t^ I cannot have so often, as I had yo^r^ company at London, but 'tis somew^t^ however y^t^ is more lasting, & by a letter I can converse w^th^ you twenty year hence, when ye subject of all o^r^ other conversations are perhaps forgotten. I coud much rather wish for yo^r^ company

[1] Harl. MS. 7001, f. 211^r^.

here y^n^ in Town, because my Head is more free, & much more capable of receiving ye benefit of it. For I had it but by halfs when ones minde is at ye same time embarast with Love & Jealousy; when hee takes every fine Petticoat hee sees for his Mistress, & every spruce Coxcomb for a Rival. If I have any business here 'tis of a very different nature; Instead of ye R^t^ Honorables & Honorables, my Billets are directed to Constables & Headboroughs; & y^t^ style y^t^ was full of begging & praying, is now spent in willing & requiring. As I am not so ambitious as Cesar who woud rather bee first in a pitiful village y^n^ second man at Rome; so I must own, the serving at London, was more agreeable to my Inclination than all ye commanding here; & I have found more pleasure in a little billet in an ill hand & worse English, than I shoud in all ye Commissiones their Ma^ties^ are capable of giving mee. These things perhaps ye Men of Business will think mee a poor spirited fellow for; & you perhaps will think mee a Coxcomb for; for w^ch^ I own you are in ye right, for 'tis very ridiculous y^t^ a mans head shoud bee allways employd in ye service of an inferiour part, but humane frailty will have it so & who can help it. Yet w^t^ever want of judgem^t^ I may shew in these foolish things, 'tis still some sign of good sense in mee, y^t^ all these fopperies cannot hinder mee from valuing you more than all ye Women together (w^ch^ I tell you only between o^r^ selves for there are 40 or 50 Ladies y^t^ woud take it very ill if they heard it; & beeing w^th^ all ye syncerity in ye World

Sr.[1]

The remaining leaves of the manuscript[2] contain part of a critical essay of which the beginning is missing. It appears to be a survey of learning in its various branches and its mockery of the antiquarian bias suggests that it may have been intended as a salvo in the developing battle between 'ancients and moderns'. That Walsh had planned to write an essay on such a theme as a preface for Dryden's play *Love Triumphant* is known from references in two of Dryden's letters to him. In May 1693 Dryden wrote:

I spoke to Mr. Tonson to send you down the Bookes you desir'd; in order to the writeing of a preface before my next Play: if hee has not done it, I will remind him of it. For I shall be very proud of your entring into the lists, though not against Rymer; yet as a champion for our cause, who defy the Chorus of the Ancients.[3]

[1] Harl. MS. 7001, ff. 211^v^ and 215^r^. The leaves of this MS. are bound in the wrong order and wrongly marked. F. 211^v^, ending with the phrase 'second man at Rome', is followed by two blank leaves, then by a leaf marked f. 214 f^o^m the critical essay; the Wycherley letter continues and ends on the leaf marked f. 215^r^. As this letter begins on the same leaf as the former letter, it is probably of about the same date.

[2] According to their wrong binding and marking, ff. 214, 215^v^, 216, 217. The order should be 215^v^, 214, 216^r^–17^v^.

[3] *Works*, ed. Scott-Saintsbury (London, 1882–93), xviii, Letter LI. Dated 'May 9th or 10th [1693]'. Rymer's *A Short View of Tragedy* had appeared in December 1692, and in it Rymer had attacked Dryden's plays.

Later that year, however, Dryden wrote:

> Your Critique, by your description of its Bulk, will be too large for a preface to my Play, which is now studying; but cannot be acted till after Christmasse is over. . . . When you do me the favour to send your Booke, I will take care to correct the press; & to have it printed well. It will be more for your Honour, too, to print it alone, & take off the suspition of your being too much my friend, I meane too partiall to me, if it comes in company of my Play.[1]

No critical work by Walsh was, as far as is known, published at that time; and it would be futile to guess whether the missing first part of his essay was a defence of modern drama, with special reference to Dryden's plays. That it is addressed to an individual[2] and not to the public suggests that it may have been intended for a prefatory address, as it is too long for a letter.

The fragment[3] reads as follows:

> Before wee part wth this Head of Critical Learning wee ought to say somew^{t} to those Professors of it; who do not descend to explain any particular Author; but occasionally make remarks upon hard places; & write dissertations ab^{t} ye names; ye times; ye Meat, & Drink, & Coaches & other such things of ye Antients. For my part I profess my self no respecter of Persons; but am for treating every body according to y^{r} Desert; & can so see no reason why ye modern Taylours shoud [not?] bee placet in ye List of Learning before ye Authors de se vestante; & ye modern Cooks before all y^{t} write concerning ye Suppers of ye Antients. I am sure if People wou'd free y^{m}selves from Prejudice they wou'd bee convincet y^{t} 'tis far more necessary to know how to dress meat at present y^{n} how they drest 2 or 3000 years agoe; & how to dress according to ye french fashion y^{n} ye Greek & Roman ones. And I must confess I cannot but wonder y^{t} among ye French who are so great Writers of Memoirs, there was never any who thought of giving us [Accounts?] of ye Fashions & Lawes of his temps & methinks tis a neglect in a Prince y^{t} is such an Encourager of Learning & keeps so many Historians in pay; y^{t} hee does not employ some upon this Occasion. If such things are not admired at present 'tis but writing for Posterity & stay the times. For there is a strange charm in a Language y^{t} is not commonly understood; & a vast deal of Merit in an Author y^{t} has been dead 2 or 3000 years. If the Commentators resemble those y^{t} are in love with one Phoenix Beauty, those Gentlemen can bee so well compar'd to nothing but those y^{t} make general Court to all ye Fair in general. Tho these too have much more Zeal y^{n} Lovers. There is nothing so strange they will not believe if an antient[4] ⟨author has said it, & nothing y^{t} they

[1] Scott-Saintsbury, op. cit., Letter LIII, 12 December 1693.

[2] 'I confess Sir I have a great deal more to say . . .', f. 217^{v}.

[3] Beginning on f. 215^{v}.

[4] F. 215^{v} ends here and, from the sense, continues with f. 214^{r}, beginning 'author has said it . . .'. This passage from the top of f. 214^{r} to 'in his Politicks' is crossed out. Other cancellations are enclosed in ⟨⟩.

will believe if they find nothing of it in Greek or Latin. Water shoud [not] have washt peoples hands if Pindar had not recommended [it] to y^{m}; nor ye whole been bigger than its Parts if they had not had Euclids word for it. Tho this too may bee called into question when they consider a more antient Author y^{n} hee; saying y^{t} Half is more than ye whole. On ye other hand 'tis an undenyable argum^{t} y^{t} there can bee no Kings but w^{t} are absolute, because Monarchy is made of [? & ?]; & no such things as Mixt Monarchyes; since Aristotle has not said a word of them in his Politicks.⟩ Nothing certainly can bee a greater Example of this; than the comparing ye treatm^{t} an author findes from ye Gentlemen I last mention'd, to what hee receives from another sort of Judges, who boldly call him to the Bar of Criticism; & make him give an account of every idle word y^{t} is scattered in his Writings. If Homer value himself upon 4 volumes y^{t} Eustathius writt in his Favour wee shall pull him down again, with ye 300 y^{t} Evilus wrot ag^{t} him; & tho Time has been so unjust as to rob ye World of this valuable Treasure ⟨yet Italy can show us 2 volumes in 4to to criticise & defend a Song of 6 Stanzas; & France [?] volumes upon ye same design in a Book of Letters.⟩ And since I have mention'd the Italians it wou'd bee unjust to take no more notice of one who was a Confessor at least if not a Martyr to this most noble kind of learning; & wth a Spiritt becoming to an old Roman chose bravely to live an Exile out of his own Countrey, rather than pass by ye Errors of a Song, y^{t} was not written according to ye Rules of Grammar & Poetry. What considerable Supporte of a Commonwealth are those Judicious Gentlemen. For after all what living wou'd there bee for People or a Governm^{t}, where Errours in Poetry went unpunisht & how shou'd they expect to bee protected by ye Laws of ye Land while ye Laws of Aristotle were neglected. But as those sort of Authors are generally recommended to my Care; I cannot but have so much for 'em as to tell em how far distant ye End they attain is from that they propose. For certainly they woud never trouble y^{m}selves wth writing books ag^{t} People if they did but consider y^{t} it was ye greatest Honour they cou'd do 'em; for as ye Ephesians by forbidding anybody to name the man who burnt y^{r} Temple; took a certain way of having his Name preserved; So those People by writing ag^{t} Books doe all y^{t} lyes in y^{m} towards ye making y^{m} Immortal.

I shall pass by the Logicians, Metaphysicians, Astrologers, Divines, and such sort of Sciences since I think ye World begins to bee weary of these Trifles without it; but I can by no means pass by ye Natural Philosophers; because they swarm again as much as ever ⟨as they did in ye time of ye Athenian Aristotle & Plato.⟩ Men finde the vanity (as they tell us) of all other Studyes & therefore betake y^{m}selves to y^{t} of Nature. And growing weary of Formes & occult Quality every one now setts up for a Systeme of his own. But I appeal to Jupiter & to all ye Gods; whether a Man had not much better write an account of the Formation of Puddings about w^{ch} severall good People may bee employ'd; y^{n} of ye formation of Worlds, about w^{ch} no Body will ever bee employ'd; whether a Postboy y^{t} knows ye distance from Paris to Rome is not a much more necessary member of a Commonwealth than hee who knows ye distance from Mercury to Saturn; & whether a new Invention of warme Boots wou'd not bee a much more

useful Discovery y^n y^t of ye Satellites about Jupiter. The Jest of it is y^t they overlook all those little Mortalls who busy y^mselves about[1] vulgar matters; & seem to imitate y^m in everything. A man shall bee very accurate in ye generation of Insects, who knows nothing of ye generation of his own Children; & busie himself about searching for Men in ye Moon; who never findes ye Men y^t are hidden in his Wifes Closet. If you askt an antient Philosopher whether ye Fire was hot; hee woud ignorantly [answer?] yes. If you ask a modern one hee nicely distinguishes: If by heat you mean power of causing ye sensation of heat in mee, hee has it; but if by Heat you mean ye sensation y^t I feel, I have no reason to believe hee has it. When I heard ye mighty Praises; & ye strange Rejoycings upon occasion of such Discoveryes; I really fancy'd y^t before these times People ignorantly ran their Hands into ye Fire; or at least y^t they had now found a way of doing it without any Injury. But when I was told y^t a plowman knew as well to keep himself out of ye Fire, as a Philosopher; & y^t an old Woman cou'd cure a Burn, as well as hee y^t had read Descartes, I must own I was at a great loss to find upon w^t it was y^t these Curious Inquirers into Nature valued y^mselves so very much.

If there bee any sort of Learning of real use to Mankind y^t w^ch has most pretence to it is History; the seeing how People formerly succeeded in y^r actions, beeing a way of teaching y^m now to succeed in them; & of all sort of Historyes those nearest their own Time & y^r own Countrey are ye most usefull for y^t Use; But alas 'tis not this y^t makes a Man called a Learned Historian. Tis not ye History of England or France, but of Egypt or Asia y^t makes a Man learned. Tis not knowing w^t was done by People of ye same disposition but w^t was done by People of ye most different Disposition y^t [?] it. Tis not ye Italian; Spanish; French or English; but Assyrian; Persian; Phoenecian; y^t gives a Man any sort of Authority among ye Learned. Tis not knowing how to form Troops Regim^ts & Brigades; but Maniples. Tis not knowing how Caesar conquered Rome; But at w^t time hee [?][2] Cohorts & Legions; tis not Bombs & Mortars; but Catapultes & Arietes: & tis not ye Siege of Candy or Ostend; but of Persepolis y^t makes a Man pass for a learned Historian.

But tis time wee come to Apollos Crew; the Orators & Poets; least they shou'd think wee had forgotten 'em. As for ye first sort who think themselves so necessary in a Commonwealth; y^t all things wou'd come to ruine without their assistance, and who soe boldly profess the art of persuading People to w^t is right; these need not Paper nor figures for ye doing y^t but only plainly & clearly explaining ye matter to y^m. And [by?] y^t they mean persuading People to w^t is not right. They are so pernicious a sort of People y^t instead of Encouraging [them there] shoud bee made severe Laws ag^t y^m; I woud as soon have schools erected for ye art of Robbing as soon as for ye art of persuading; & treat Publick

[1] F. 214^v ends here. It is followed by f. 215^r on which is written the end of the Wycherley letter and f. 215^v on which this fragment of the essay begins. Then the passage continues on the folio marked 216^r.

[2] The word or words here not legible. F. 216^r ends here and is followed by an exact duplication of this and preceding folio, evidently made with some form of copying paper. The passage continues on f. 216^v with 'Cohorts & Legions . . .'.

will believe if they find nothing of it in Greek or Latin. Water shoud [not] have washt peoples hands if Pindar had not recommended [it] to y^m; nor ye whole been bigger than its Parts if they had not had Euclids word for it. Tho this too may bee called into question when they consider a more antient Author y^n hee; saying y^t Half is more than ye whole. On ye other hand 'tis an undenyable argum^t y^t there can bee no Kings but w^t are absolute, because Monarchy is made of [? & ?]; & no such things as Mixt Monarchyes; since Aristotle has not said a word of them in his Politicks.⟩ Nothing certainly can bee a greater Example of this; than the comparing ye treatm^t an author findes from ye Gentlemen I last mention'd, to what hee receives from another sort of Judges, who boldly call him to the Bar of Criticism; & make him give an account of every idle word y^t is scattered in his Writings. If Homer value himself upon 4 volumes y^t Eustathius writt in his Favour wee shall pull him down again, with ye 300 y^t Evilus wrot ag^t him; & tho Time has been so unjust as to rob ye World of this valuable Treasure ⟨yet Italy can show us 2 volumes in 4to to criticise & defend a Song of 6 Stanzas; & France [?] volumes upon ye same design in a Book of Letters.⟩ And since I have mention'd the Italians it wou'd bee unjust to take no more notice of one who was a Confessor at least if not a Martyr to this most noble kind of learning; & w^th a Spiritt becoming to an old Roman chose bravely to live an Exile out of his own Countrey, rather than pass by ye Errors of a Song, y^t was not written according to ye Rules of Grammar & Poetry. What considerable Supporte of a Commonwealth are those Judicious Gentlemen. For after all what living wou'd there bee for People or a Governm^t, where Errours in Poetry went unpunisht & how shou'd they expect to bee protected by ye Laws of ye Land while ye Laws of Aristotle were neglected. But as those sort of Authors are generally recommended to my Care; I cannot but have so much for 'em as to tell em how far distant ye End they attain is from that they propose. For certainly they woud never trouble y^mselves w^th writing books ag^t People if they did but consider y^t it was ye greatest Honour they cou'd do 'em; for as ye Ephesians by forbidding anybody to name the man who burnt y^r Temple; took a certain way of having his Name preserved; So those People by writing ag^t Books doe all y^t lyes in y^m towards ye making y^m Immortal.

I shall pass by the Logicians, Metaphysicians, Astrologers, Divines, and such sort of Sciences since I think ye World begins to bee weary of these Trifles without it; but I can by no means pass by ye Natural Philosophers; because they swarm again as much as ever ⟨as they did in ye time of ye Athenian Aristotle & Plato.⟩ Men finde the vanity (as they tell us) of all other Studyes & therefore betake y^mselves to y^t of Nature. And growing weary of Formes & occult Quality every one now setts up for a Systeme of his own. But I appeal to Jupiter & to all ye Gods; whether a Man had not much better write an account of the Formation of Puddings about w^ch severall good People may bee employ'd; y^n of ye formation of Worlds, about w^ch no Body will ever bee employ'd; whether a Postboy y^t knows ye distance from Paris to Rome is not a much more necessary member of a Commonwealth than hee who knows ye distance from Mercury to Saturn; & whether a new Invention of warme Boots wou'd not bee a much more

useful Discovery y^n y^t of ye Satellites about Jupiter. The Jest of it is y^t they overlook all those little Mortalls who busy y^mselves about[1] vulgar matters; & seem to imitate y^m in everything. A man shall bee very accurate in ye generation of Insects, who knows nothing of ye generation of his own Children; & busie himself about searching for Men in ye Moon; who never findes ye Men y^t are hidden in his Wifes Closet. If you askt an antient Philosopher whether ye Fire was hot; hee woud ignorantly [answer?] yes. If you ask a modern one hee nicely distinguishes: If by heat you mean power of causing ye sensation of heat in mee, hee has it; but if by Heat you mean ye sensation y^t I feel, I have no reason to believe hee has it. When I heard ye mighty Praises; & ye strange Rejoycings upon occasion of such Discoveryes; I really fancy'd y^t before these times People ignorantly ran their Hands into ye Fire; or at least y^t they had now found a way of doing it without any Injury. But when I was told y^t a plowman knew as well to keep himself out of ye Fire, as a Philosopher; & y^t an old Woman cou'd cure a Burn, as well as hee y^t had read Descartes, I must own I was at a great loss to find upon w^t it was y^t these Curious Inquirers into Nature valued y^mselves so very much.

If there bee any sort of Learning of real use to Mankind y^t w^ch has most pretence to it is History; the seeing how People formerly succeeded in y^r actions, beeing a way of teaching y^m now to succeed in them; & of all sort of Historyes those nearest their own Time & y^r own Countrey are ye most usefull for y^t Use; But alas 'tis not this y^t makes a Man called a Learned Historian. Tis not ye History of England or France, but of Egypt or Asia y^t makes a Man learned. Tis not knowing w^t was done by People of ye same disposition but w^t was done by People of ye most different Disposition y^t [?] it. Tis not ye Italian; Spanish; French or English; but Assyrian; Persian; Phoenecian; y^t gives a Man any sort of Authority among ye Learned. Tis not knowing how to form Troops Regim^ts & Brigades; but Maniples. Tis not knowing how Caesar conquered Rome; But at w^t time hee [?][2] Cohorts & Legions; tis not Bombs & Mortars; but Catapultes & Arietes: & tis not ye Siege of Candy or Ostend; but of Persepolis y^t makes a Man pass for a learned Historian.

But tis time wee come to Apollos Crew; the Orators & Poets; least they shou'd think wee had forgotten 'em. As for ye first sort who think themselves so necessary in a Commonwealth; y^t all things wou'd come to ruine without their assistance, and who soe boldly profess the art of persuading People to w^t is right; these need not Paper nor figures for ye doing y^t but only plainly & clearly explaining ye matter to y^m. And [by?] y^t they mean persuading People to w^t is not right. They are so pernicious a sort of People y^t instead of Encouraging [them there] shoud bee made severe Laws ag^t y^m; I woud as soon have schools erected for ye art of Robbing as soon as for ye art of persuading; & treat Publick

[1] F. 214^v ends here. It is followed by f. 215^r on which is written the end of the Wycherley letter and f. 215^v on which this fragment of the essay begins. Then the passage continues on the folio marked 216^r.

[2] The word or words here not legible. F. 216^r ends here and is followed by an exact duplication of this and preceding folio, evidently made with some form of copying paper. The passage continues on f. 216^v with 'Cohorts & Legions . . .'.

Orators as one wou'd do Publick Highwaymen. But let us not bee so severe ag^{t} y^{m}; the Gentlemen [to] give y^{m} y^{r} due have no such dangerous qualityes; & if they are punisht, it must bee only as Witches are for fancying y^{m}selves capable of doing y^{t} Mischief; w^{ch} no Wise man ever believ'd they coud do. Let one of ye most florid orators loose in an English Parliam^{t} or Venetian Senate; let him make use of ye quaintest [Exordium?] in Cicero; to gain ye good will of his Audience & let him employ all ye schemes of Demosthenes; If hee persuade his audience into anything, but the believing him a Coxcomb; I will bee bound to answer for all ye Damage hee does; For Alas Jupiter tis a very melancholly thing to consider how Art is neglected; The Rogues now adayes mind a Mans Sense more than his Expressions; & consider only whether the thing hee sayes bee true; & not whether it bee well spoken.[1]

I am sensible y^{t} I have been a little long upon this Subject. However to make w^{t} haste I can, I will only say a word or two to ye Poets & have done. Those Gents think y^{m}selves so much above ye profane vulgar, y^{t} they place y^{m}selves in a different Species; and to confess ye truth differ from other writers just as Dancing Masters do from other Men. Tis true did a Man shew himself a Poet only now & then w^{n} hee writes verses; ye Case wou'd not bee quite so bad; but one never sees Poetry get into a Mans Head, but hee is absolutely unfit for any other business. Hee is not only a Poet in his Discourse; a Poet in his Mien; a a Poet in his Cloathes; a Poet in his Meat & Drink; & in fine is a Poet per omnes casus. And indeed how can it bee otherwayes if it bee as some of them tell us, y^{t} a Man must bee at least 9 year correcting a Poem before hee lets it appear. And y^{t} you may not think this only a fantastical rule y^{t} never any body follow'd; They tell us with a great deal of gravity; y^{t} Virgil employd 3 years time in ten short copyes of Verses y^{t} hee calls Eclogues; seven about 4 book[s] of his Georgicks; and eleven upon his Aeneid, w^{ch} however hee left unfinisht; Another Poet who thought himself as near to him in his Poems as hee happens to bee in his Grave boasts of having been 20 years in writing one Poem. ⟨This indeed takes in ye Orators too; who require as long a time for polishing y^{r} Expressions; & preparing y^{r} Periods; so y^{t} wee have [an] antient of y^{m} y^{t} was 15 years a making one speech.⟩ And of late times a French Poet was so long about a Copy of consolatory Verses to a Gent. upon the Death of his Wife, y^{t} hee had time enough to mourn out his year, marry a new Wife; & had two Children by her before ye Poet had finished his Verses to comfort him for ye loss of ye first. Certainly these People think Men were sent into ye World for no other reason than to write Verses, & think Minos will bee very well satisfyd when they present him with a correct Poem; to make amends for an incorrect Life. One thing wee may observe not only of ye Poets but indeed of all ye Learned, y^{t} they are good only for one thing & those y^{t} make ye greatest noise in their Closetts; make but a very foolish figure when they come into ye World. St. Amant a French Poet was employd as an envoy to Sweden upon so great an occasion as to congratulate ye birth of a Child; & yet as little as it was hee made a shift to mistake it; & go away wthout his Credentialls & Cardinal Bessarion y^{t} great Restorer of Greek Learning beeing

[1] End of f. 216^{v}. The passage continues on f. 217^{r} and ends, with the end of the manuscript, on f. 217^{v}.

appointed Ambassador from France to Venice managed himself so very ridiculously as to ruine all his Masters Affairs; & give occasion for ye Spanish ambassadors observation to ye Senate; y^t^ they must expect fine usage from a Kg. if they had need of his assistance; who affronted y^m^ w^th^ sending a Pedant amongst them w^n^ hee had occasion of theirs.

I confess Sir I have a great deal more to say upon these Subjects if I had time; but I have been long enough allready, besides I see Apollo swell up as if hee were going to pronounce an Oracle, & Minerva ready to throw a Cartload of Greek Sentences in my Face; Tis time therefore to have done, & give other Deityes ye Liberty of tiring you in their turns.[1]

British Museum Additional MS. 38001 contains twenty-three poems by Walsh, of which sixteen[2] are versions of poems published in *Letters and Poems Amorous and Gallant* (1692) and seven are unpublished. These latter are as follows:

(*a*) Upon the Stormy Weather at her going out of Town[3]

How all ye World is changed since you are gone?
While you were here the Sun serenely shon;
Each morning strove the former to outdo,
As if the Heavens were grown our Rivalls too;
But when the glorious Caelia disappears,
Like us they groan, like us they burst in Tears.

(*b*) Elegy[4]

Caelia, 'tis own'd I have not us'd the Art
To charm a Haughtie Beautie's scornful Heart;
Women from Childhood bred up to Deceit,
Love to bee cheated, as they love to cheat;
And to that Sex to show our Humours bare,
Is with known Cheats to play upon the Square.
But whatsoever Interest might advise,
A Generous Soul abhors a mean disguise;
The Ugly, conscious of their own Defect,
The faults of Nature, may by Art correct;
But if a Nymph a perfect Beauty bee
The more you see, the more her Charms you see.

[1] The essay ends here on f. 217^v^, and with it the Walsh material in Harl. MS. 7001 ends.

[2] (i) 'Daphne, A Pastoral Eclogue' f. 3; (ii) 'The Fair Mourner' f. 4; (iii) 'Epigram To his false Mistress' f. 4; (iv) 'To Celinda against Marriage' f. 4^v^; (v) 'Cure of Jealousy' f. 5; (vi) 'Death, A Sonnet' f. 5^v^; (vii) 'Jealousie' f. 6; (viii) 'Elegy to his Mistress' f. 7^v^; (ix) 'The Antidote' f. 9; (x) 'Upon a favour offer'd' f. 9^v^; (xi) 'The Reconcilement' f. 9^v^; (xii) 'Dialogue Between a Lover & his Friend' f. 10; (xiii) 'Epigramm on Lyce' f. 10^v^; (xiv) 'The Power of Verse' f. 11; (xv) 'Elegy To his false Mistress' f. 11^v^; (xvi) 'Upon the same Occasion' f. 12^v^.

[3] 3^v^. This is the only unpublished poem not crossed out. The remaining six are crossed lightly, perhaps for the publisher's information.

[4] f. 5^v^.

Those sudden Storms that in my Breast have place,
Are but like Moles upon a beauteous face;
I am by Nature Easy form'd & milde,
Calm as the Seas on which the Halcyons build.
But when fierce Jealousy distracts my Minde,
I roar like waves[1] tost by the Northern Winde;
Promiscuously on all my Rage I vent;
But at the least Submission I relent.
No more yo[r] frailties[2] then, but my own[3] I blame
And all my Fury turns to conscious Shame.

(*c*) The Reasonable Request[4]

Caelia I quitt my vain design,
I see the Man is mad
Who thinks a Woman to confine,
When Men are to be had.

Since Lovers must for change bee kept,
I to your Laws submitt
With pleasure, if you will accept
Of none but Men of Witt.

But Witts are scarce, besides you cry
They're not the handsom'st Men;
Will you engage no Man to try
But who is handsome then.

But Handsom Men you'll say are Vain,
And not for service best;
Well Caelia then thy self restrain
To Gentlemen at least.

But see ye Powers, the Fool, the Knave,
The Wise, the Great, the Small;
Without distinction, like the Grave,
Her Arms receive 'em all.

Hold Caelia I my Error see
And shall the favour own;
Will you engage you'll constant bee
To Humane kinde alone.

(*d*) Elegie[5]

Long had I born her perjur'd vows with Pain,[6]
At last resolv'd to break th'unequal Chain;

[1] 'sea' crossed out. [2] 'faults' crossed out.
[3] 'my own' should have been changed to 'mine' when 'frailties' was substituted for 'faults'. [4] f. 7[r]. [5] f. 8[r]. [6] 'a Jilt with horrid [Pain]' crossed out.

And to part fairly, took my leave in Strains
As soft & sweet as those of dying Swans.
Go, said the Nymph, some happier Maid adore,
And never, never see Celinda more;
But come to night; there are some things I fain
Wou'd say, & since wee ne'er must meet again
If half the Love were true you once profest,
You cannot sure refuse my last request.

Yet long my Brest against the Torrent strove,
And like a Rock repell'd the Waves of Love.
Till hopeless by her storms success to finde,
Thus with soft Words my Soul shee undermined.
Thyrsis I know yor Fears & vile Distrust
And some I own, perhaps have been too just;
What shall I say? Youth, Mens deceitful Tricks,
And Vanitie too frequent[1] in our Sex,
Have upon Indiscretions made mee run
Which I now see, & now resolve to shun.
But yet—(Why shou'd I blush to speak what's true)
I swear none ever had my Heart but you;
Cou'd you believe, nay cou'd you but forgive,
By Heaven and Earth,—but oh in vain I strive,
In vain I talk, my words are thrown away,
On one who never credits[2] what I say.

Shee sighs, shee lean'd her Head upon my Brest,
And floods of falling Tears explain the rest.
Gods was there ever Man that cou'd unmoved
Behold the Passion of the Fair hee loved;
Close in my Arms I prest the Charming Maid,
And with an equal Flood her Tears repay'd.
Oh can that precious Shower bee lost on mee,
By all the Gods I love to that degree.

Ill natur'd, false, deceitful as thou art,
Had thy sharp Pogniard stabb'd my faithful Heart;
One Tear of thine wou'd all my rage confound
And make mee bless the Hand, that gave the Wound.
You who know most of Women's Vertuous Deeds
Hear now a Story that[3] Belief exceeds.
When I went out I left her on the bed
New Vows of Love, new Protestations made;
Tears in her Eyes, & Sorrow in her face,
When waiting for a Chairman neer ye place,

[1] 'usual' crossed out.
[2] 'neer mindes, ne'er creditts' crossed out.
[3] 'all' crossed out.

I saw another lusty Youth lett in,
Let in, & ne'er that Night let out again.

Is there ye Pow'rs a Man on Earth can finde
The secret Workings of a Woman's Minde?
When I had left her to enjoy her rest[1]
And calm'd the raging feaver of my Brest;
Why shou'd shee strive my Passion to reduce,
To meet fresh Treachery & fresh Abuse?

Vile Wretch whose Reason raging Passion charms,
Go, take some Brainless Blockhead to thy Arms;
So mean thy Tricks are, yet so grossly lay'd,
Thou'lt neer make Fools, but those that God has made.
What Madness made thee try thy Cheats on mee
All Men, all Creatures are alike to thee;
Sure tho' thy Modesty's entirely fled,
Thy Conscience harden'd & thy Vertue dead,
Yet thy Steeld forhead[2] will bee cloathed in Shame,
When e'er thou seest my face, or hearst my Name.

(*e*) Epigramm Upon Caelia[3]

Nature to all does due division make,
And what Men want in Brains they have[4] in Back;
Wee therefore must approve fair Caelia's rules,
Who talks with Men of Witt, but lyes with Fools.

(*f*) The Advice[5]

Strephon tis own'd that you
Have Beauty, Witt & Love;
Malus who none can show
Does your Clorinda move.

But all the time you gett
In talking you employ,
Hee plagues her not with Witt,
But boldly reaps the Joy.

Quitt Quitt this foolish part,
And likelyer Methods try;
For aiming at her Heart,
You mount[6] your Guns too high.

In Councils Witt & Sence,
Perhaps a Point may gain,
But are a dull Pretence,
When Towns are to be ta'en.

[1] 'When I went out I left her on' crossed out. [2] 'visage' crossed out.
[3] f. 9[r]. [4] 'get' crossed out. [5] f. 11[v]. [6] 'play' and 'place' crossed out.

In vain a Youth to move her
By soft expressions tryes,
The Soldier, & the Lover
Shou'd bee more bold, than wise.

(*g*) Elegy[1]

Happy the man indulgent Heaven does bless
With little riches, if content[2] with less,
At rest & easy[3] with his Native Store,
Hee neither toyls, nor breaks his sleep[4] for more;
But happyer far who in his faithful Breast,
Admitts one faire one, & excludes the rest;
Her hee pursues, on her alone does wait
And from her Smiles or Frowns attends his Fate.
While fifty Nymphs at once my Heart enthrall,
I'm burning, raging, dying for 'em all.
And one deceiving mee torments my Minde,[5]
Tho all the forty nine beside are kinde.[6]

Two now above the rest tryumphant sitt,
With equal Beauty both, & equal Witt;
One loves mee truly, while the one betrays,
This strives to plague mee, & that strives to please.
And yet with folly fatal to my rest,
The Jilt that treats mee worst, I love the best.
Shaken[7] by Storms of Jelousy & Doubt,
The cursed Tree of Love takes deeper root.[8]

Vanquisht by that Esteem her Meritts raise,
I promise one the Heart the other has;
Oh Love! why am I us'd by thee so ill,
And forc't to play the Knave against my Will;
Let not the Wise or Vertuous think to drive[9]
A Trade where none but Fools or Villains thrive;
But as for women,[10] 'tis ordain'd by Fate,
One half cheat us and t'other half wee cheat.

[1] f. 12^{v}. [2] 'hee wishes' crossed out. [3] 'Humbly contented' crossed out.
[4] 'rest' crossed out. [5] 'And if one jilts mee, that disturbs my Minde' crossed out.
[6] 'nine &' and 'else' crossed out; it read 'Tho all the nine & forty else'.
[7] 'While shook' crossed out.
[8] f. 12^{v} ends here. The MS. is wrongly bound and numbered and the remainder of the poem continues on f. 9^{r}, where it is followed by 'Epigramm Upon Caelia'.
[9] 'Vertuous ever try to drive' crossed out; the line read 'Let not the Vertuous ever try to drive'.
[10] 'For of the Women' crossed out.

THE THIRD MAN AT NEWGATE

By WILLIAM J. CARLTON

BY the autumn of 1835 the pseudonym 'Boz' was becoming known to an ever-widening circle of readers as that of the author of a number of slight papers which were characterized by an uncommon keenness of observation and delicacy of touch. These papers had been printed in half a dozen newspapers and periodicals, including the *Morning Chronicle* on which Dickens was engaged as a reporter, and he was negotiating for their publication in collected form with John Macrone, who had expressed a favourable opinion of the prospects of such a book.

Appreciating that his published sketches would barely suffice to fill the two volumes contemplated, Dickens proposed to add two or three new ones 'to make weight' and wrote to Macrone on 27 October: 'With this view I have begged Black to get old Alderman Wood to take me to Newgate—as an amateur of course. I have long projected sketching its interior, and I think it would tell extremely well.' Two days later he advised the publisher that a request had been sent to the Alderman for an order admitting two persons to see 'that interesting spot to which an *order* for admission is very frequently granted', adding that he would report progress next day.

Alderman Matthew Wood (then in his 68th year) must have been well known to John Black, the editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, as a staunch supporter of the movement for reform. An Alderman of the City of London since 1807, he had twice been Lord Mayor and had sat continuously as M.P. for the City since 1817. During his second mayoralty he had quelled a serious riot in Newgate by his presence and firmness. He did much to improve the state of prison discipline, securing the release of debtors from Newgate and the building of a new prison for them. He became Sir Matthew Wood in 1837 when Queen Victoria conferred on him a baronetcy—the first title bestowed by the young sovereign.

Dickens's application seems to have been granted promptly, and it was probably on the following Thursday, 5 November, that 'Boz' and his publisher presented themselves at Newgate. We know that it was a Thursday, for Dickens wrote to his fiancée from Furnival's Inn on 'Thursday afternoon': 'I have been today over Newgate, and the House of Correction, and have lots of anecdotes to tell you of both places when I see you tomorrow—some of them rather amusing: at least to me, for I was intensely interested in everything I saw.'[1] Dickens and Macrone were joined un-

[1] *Mr. and Mrs. Charles Dickens*, ed. W. Dexter (London, 1935), pp. 34–35.

expectedly by a third man in circumstances which he has himself explained. Nathaniel Parker Willis, the American journalist, poet, and man-about-town, whose *Pencillings by the Way* was published by Macrone towards the end of the same month, chanced to be in London on that day. Strolling along the Strand with cloak and umbrella, and looking at people and shop windows, he was hailed by a passenger in a street cab.

> From out of the smoke of the wet straw appeared the head of my publisher, Mr. Macrone (a most liberal and noble-hearted fellow, since dead). After a little catechism as to my damp destiny for that morning, he informed me that he was going to visit Newgate, and asked me to join him. I willingly agreed, never having seen this famous prison, and after I was seated in the cab, he said he was going to pick up, on the way, a young paragraphist for the *Morning Chronicle* who wished to write a description of it.
>
> In the most crowded part of Holborn, within a door or two of the 'Bull and Mouth' inn (the great starting and stopping-place of the stage coaches), we pulled up at the entrance of a large building used for lawyers' chambers. Not to leave me sitting in the rain, Macrone asked me to dismount with him. I followed up long flights of stairs to an upper storey, and was ushered into an uncarpeted and bleak-looking room, with a deal table and two or three chairs and a few books, a small boy[1] and Mr. Dickens for the contents. I was only struck at first with one thing (and I made a memorandum of it that evening, as the strongest instance I had seen of English obsequiousness to employers)—the degree to which the poor author was overpowered with the honour of his publisher's visit! I remember saying to myself, as I sat down on a rickety chair, 'My good fellow, if you were in America, with that fine face and your ready quill, you would have no need to be condescended to by a publisher!' Dickens was dressed very much as he has since described 'Dick Swiveller'—minus the 'swell' look. His hair was cropped close to his head, his clothes scant, though jauntily cut, and after changing a ragged office-coat for a shabby blue, he stood by the door, collarless and buttoned up, the very personification, I thought, of a close sailer to the wind.

This part of Willis's narrative was relegated to a footnote in Forster's biography of Dickens, with the comment: 'I remember, while my friend lived, our laughing heartily at this description, hardly a word of which is true.' J. W. T. Ley went much farther when he declared roundly in his annotated edition of Forster:

> Not only was this description of Dickens and his rooms untrue, but it is certain that he never met Dickens at all. He visited Europe in 1831. Dickens was not living at Furnival's Inn then, and never knew Macrone until 1836. Willis visited England again in 1837. Dickens was then married and living in Doughty Street. The whole story was an absolute fabrication.[2]

[1] Dickens's younger brother, Frederick, aged fourteen, was living with him at Furnival's Inn.

[2] *The Life of Charles Dickens*, ed. J. W. T. Ley (London, 1928), p. 80.

It might be thought that so grave an indictment, brought by one writer against another, would be supported by some reference to authorities, but Ley made no attempt to justify his dogmatic assertions, most of which were sadly wide of the mark.

Let us first read the conclusion of Willis's story, omitted by both Forster and his commentator:

> We went down and crowded into the cab (one passenger more than the law allowed, and Dickens partly in my lap and partly in Macrone's) and drove on to Newgate. In his works, if you remember, there is a description of the prison, drawn from this day's observation. We were there an hour or two, and were shown some of the celebrated murderers confined for life, and one young soldier waiting for execution; and in one of the passages we chanced to meet Mrs. Fry, on her usual errand of benevolence. Though interested in Dickens's face, I forgot him naturally enough after we entered the prison, and I do not think I heard him speak during the two hours. I parted from him at the door of the prison, and continued my stroll into the city.
>
> Not long after this, Macrone sent me the sheets of *Sketches by Boz*, with a note saying that they were by the gentleman who went with us to Newgate. I read the book with amazement at the genius displayed in it, and in my note of reply assured Macrone that I thought his fortune was made as a publisher if he could monopolize the author.
>
> Two or three years afterwards I was in London, and present at the complimentary dinner given to Macready.[1] Samuel Lover, who sat next me, pointed out Dickens. I looked up and down the table, but was wholly unable to single him out without getting my friend to number the people who sat above him. He was no more like the same man I had seen than a tree in June is like the same tree in February. He sat leaning his head on his hand while Bulwer was speaking, and with his very long hair, his very flash waistcoat, his chains and rings, and withal a much paler face than of old, he was totally unrecognizable. The comparison was very interesting to me, and I looked at him a long time. He was then in his culmination of popularity, and seemed jaded to stupefaction. Remembering the glorious works he had written since I had seen him, I longed to pay him my homage, but had no opportunity, and I did not see him again till he came over to reap his harvest and upset his haycart in America. When all the ephemera of his imprudences and improvidences shall have passed away—say twenty years hence—I should like to see him again, renowned as he will be for the most original and remarkable works of his time.

The passage in which Nat Willis told of his visit to Dickens in November 1835 does not appear to have been printed until ten years after the events recorded—in the 'Ephemera' section of *Dashes at Life with a Free Pencil* (New York, 1845)—and was obviously written not long before that date.

[1] A public banquet was given to Macready at the Freemasons' Tavern on 20 July 1839 to mark the termination of the actor's management at Covent Garden Theatre.

John Macrone died on 9 September 1837, it was not until the spring of 1840 that Dick Swiveller made his bow in Chapter II of *The Old Curiosity Shop*, and Dickens paid his first visit to America in 1842. Allowing for this lapse of time and the freedom of Willis's pencil, the substantial accuracy of his account of their first meeting is amply corroborated by the evidence available.

Willis had landed at Dover, after a six months' tour in the Mediterranean, on 1 June 1834. On 19 June he breakfasted with Charles and Mary Lamb at the house of Crabb Robinson. Three months later he set out for Scotland and was in Edinburgh when Dickens and Beard were reporting the great 'Grey Festival' in the Scottish capital on 15 September. Although not among the guests at the dinner, he went to the public ball at the Assembly Room the next evening, noted 'Lord Grey's statesmanlike head bowing industriously on the platform', and danced till three in the morning.[1] Willis spent the next twelve months in London and its vicinity, and on 1 October 1835 married Miss Mary Stace at Plumstead. Two days after the wedding the pair left for a fortnight's honeymoon in Paris, returning to spend the winter in England. They were in London on 5 November, for Macready, who dined with Edward Fox Fitzgerald on that day, records that 'Hayward, N. P. Willis and bride, and some other unknowns came in the evening'. Hayward introduced him to Willis, with whom he chatted of America.[2] In May 1836 Willis sailed with his wife for the United States. On 20 May 1839 they left again for England and stayed until April 1840.[3]

Further proof of Willis's *bona fides* is provided by his allusion to the presence of Elizabeth Fry at Newgate. Dickens makes no mention of her in his sketch, which Willis had read, but his correspondence with Macrone bears out the American's statement.

Only two days after his visit to the prison Dickens had been dispatched post haste to Bristol to report for the *Morning Chronicle* the proceedings at a dinner given to Lord John Russell by his constituents on 10 November. Returning to London a day or two later, he was soon busily occupied with the libretto for *The Village Coquettes*, and on the evening of Monday 16 November was at the Olympic Theatre to report for his newspaper a performance of the operetta *Comfortable Service*. On 'Wednesday evening' (probably 18 November) he wrote to his fiancée Catherine Hogarth, excusing himself for not calling to see her on the ground that

> Macrone has urged me most imperatively and pressingly to get on. I have made considerable progress in my 'Newgate' sketch, but . . . I have so much

[1] *Pencillings by the Way* (London, 1835), iii. 181.

[2] *Diaries of W. C. Macready*, ed. W. Toynbee (London, 1912), i. 261–2.

[3] Henry A. Beers, *Nathaniel Parker Willis* (Boston, 1885); *Dictionary of American Biography*, xx (1936), 307.

difficulty in remembering the place, and arranging my materials, that I really have no alternative but to remain at home tonight, and 'get on' in good earnest.

On the following Friday morning Dickens informed his publisher that he had been very busy on the two previous days writing 'A Visit to Newgate'. Black and Hogarth had agreed in declaring that it would 'make' any book. Macrone, too, signified his approval, and on 9 December the author wrote to him:

I am highly gratified with your opinion of Newgate . . . no praise I have received or can receive for it, affords me greater pleasure. The two points you mention I had not forgotten; I rejected them purposely after mature deliberation. With regard to Mrs. Fry, I saw a quakeress in the office, and turning round to you in jest, said—'Mrs. Fry'; but whether it was really her, or some other good quakeress of whom there are numbers, God only knows—I am not even sure she's alive; if she is, she must, I should think, be older than the lady we saw.[1]

Dickens's sketch, 'A Visit to Newgate', was published in February 1836, in the first volume of the first series of *Sketches by Boz*. A detailed description of the prison and its inmates concludes with one of the 'press-room'—a long, sombre room, with two windows sunk into the stone wall—where three men who had been condemned to death were segregated from the other prisoners.

The fate of one of these men was uncertain; some mitigatory circumstances having come to light since his trial, which had been humanely represented in the proper quarter. The other two had nothing to expect from the mercy of the crown; their doom was sealed; no plea could be urged in extenuation of their crime, and they well knew that for them there was no hope in this world. 'The two short ones', the turnkey whispered, 'were dead men.' . . . The first man was pacing up and down the court with a firm military step—he had been a soldier in the foot-guards—and a cloth cap jauntily thrown on one side of his head. The other two remained . . . motionless as statues.

A footnote informs the reader that these two men were executed shortly afterwards; the other was respited during his Majesty's pleasure.

All three men had been tried and condemned to death at the Central Criminal Court on 26 September 1835. Robert Swan, aged thirty-two, a private soldier in the Scotch Fusilier Guards, was found guilty of robbery with menaces, John Smith and John Pratt were convicted of an unnatural offence. Swan was reprieved by the king on 22 November. Five days later Smith and Pratt were hanged in front of the prison.[2]

[1] The famous prison reformer was then in her fifty-sixth year and continued her self-denying work for the female prisoners of Newgate until within a few years of her death in 1845.

[2] *The Times*, 28 Sept., 23 and 28 Nov. 1835.

The poignant description of the last hours of a condemned felon in Dickens's sketch was in some sort a preliminary essay for the still more powerful account of Fagin's last night at Newgate, written two years later for *Oliver Twist*. Newgate seems to have exercised a peculiar fascination over him. He paid another visit to it on 27 June 1837, accompanied by Forster, Macready, and Hablot K. Browne, and was startled to recognize in one of the cells Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, the poisoner.[1]

Dickens and Willis met again at the 'Boz Ball' given in honour of the novelist at the Park Theatre, New York, on 14 February 1842. Willis told his wife that he had spent an afternoon showing Mrs. Dickens the splendours of Broadway and had danced with her at the Ball. To a friend he wrote that 'this most loveable of authors' had shown him an exquisite drawing of his four children by Maclise, 'with Grip the raven perched gravely on the back of the chair in which the youngest was seated'.[2] On 30 April in the same year Dickens wrote him a cordial letter from Niagara, regretting that he would not have time to accept an invitation to visit the Willises at their home in Oswego.[3]

The indiscretions of Nathaniel Parker Willis were notorious, and his gossipy chronicle of experiences in England gave offence to many of those who had showed him hospitality in this country. The naïve complacency of some passages in the account of his first meeting with Dickens may well have provoked the hilarity of the novelist and his biographer ten years later, when Dickens was at the pinnacle of his fame; but the patronizing style which he affected does not invalidate his competence as an observer. This paper will have fulfilled its purpose if it succeeds in vindicating Willis from the charge of having deliberately fabricated a story which, shorn of its priggishness, constitutes a valuable addition to our knowledge of Dickens's activities in the pre-Pickwickian period.

[1] *Diaries of Macready*, ed. cit., i. 401.
[2] *Dickensian*, iv (Aug. 1908), 204; xii (Sept. 1916), 244.
[3] Beers, op. cit., p. 264.

NOTES

A HUNDRED-NAME

A CORRESPONDENT recently consulted me about the strange name *Kiftsgate* in Gloucestershire. I could only refer him to the explanation given by O. S. Anderson (Arngart) in *English Hundred-Names*, vol. ii, but the query directed my attention again to the name and aroused my interest in its etymology. I found that an alternative explanation may be worthy of consideration.

The hundred forms the north-eastern portion of Gloucestershire and is the district of Winchcombe and Chipping Campden. The meeting-place was at Kiftsgate on the edge of the hill west of Chipping Campden. The name appears as *Cheftesihat* 1086 DB, *Keftes-*, *Kiftesgatehundredum* 1183 ff. P, *Kyftesgate* 1220 Fees, *Kuftesgate* 1227 ff. Pat, *Kiftegate* 1251 Pat (Anderson, op. cit., pp. 18 f.).

According to Anderson the first element is possibly an OE. **cyft* 'hill', derived from the root **kub* 'to curve' and related to OE. *cȳf* 'tub' and the like. The same element is possibly found in *Kefthulle* (p) 1327 Subsidy Roll for Hants; the person is recorded under Northington.

This etymology is intrinsically unexceptionable and it suits the local conditions. But *cyft* is unrecorded in English and without parallel in other Germanic languages, and there is an alternative explanation according to which *cyft* would be a counterpart of a word well evidenced in Continental Germanic and with a meaning which would suit a hundred-name.

I suggest that **cyft* is a derivative with a *ti*-suffix from OE. *cuman* 'to come', corresponding to OHG. *qhuumft*, *cumft*, *cunft*, MHG. *kunft* 'coming'. The same base is found in Gothic *gaqumps* f. 'meeting, conference', rendering Greek *συναγωγή*, *συνέδριον*. A corresponding word with a voiced fricative due to Verner's law is ON. *samkund* 'meeting'.

The base would be PrGmc. **kwumpi-*, whence PrE. **kumfti-* or the like, later **kūfti-* and OE. **cȳft*. An analogous case is OE. *sēfte* 'soft' from **samftia-*, corresponding to OHG. *samfti*, OSax. *sâfte* (*sâfto* adv.), the base being apparently PrGmc. **sampia-*.

If my suggestion is correct, the OE. word must have been a counterpart of Gothic *gaqumps*, an OE. **gecȳft* with the meaning 'meeting, conference'. The hundred-name would mean 'gate where meetings were held'. The suitability of such a name is a point in favour of the theory.

The usual form *Kiftes-* with the masculine or neuter genitival ending *-es* indicates that the OE. **gecȳft* was a neuter noun like many other old

feminines with the prefix *ge-*, as *gecynd*, *genyht* (Sievers-Brunner, *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, § 267 b).

The usual word for 'coming' is OE. *cyme*, but Old English may have had two words with this meaning; cf. OHG. *kumi* by the side of *kunft*. But the word* *gecȳft* may be a specially Gloucestershire one. The county belonged to the old territory of the Hwicce, whose vocabulary may have included words not recorded in other dialect areas. For another possibly Hwiccian word reference may be made to my book *Studies on English Place-names* (1936), p. 61 (OE. *sūlig* 'pigsty'). But if *Kefthulle* of 1327 contains the word **gecȳft* and means 'assembly hill', the word would have been used also in Hants.

EILERT EKWALL

THE TRIAL OF THE PRINCES IN THE *ARCADIA*, BOOK V

THE trial in which Sidney's *Arcadia* culminates raises questions vital to the understanding of the author's purpose. Yet the only critical discussion of the trial, that of Dr. Rowe,[1] is carried out only in terms of a conflict between romantic love and parental authority—a conflict which may be, as Dr. Rowe claims, 'one of the most pervasive and significant themes in Elizabethan literature and society' but is certainly far from exhausting the significance of the passage.

The circumstances, it will be remembered, are that the heroes, Pyrocles and Musidorus, after a period of knight-errantry in Asia Minor, have come to Arcadia and there become enamoured of two princesses, Pamela and Philoclea, whose father Basilius, king of Arcadia, has forbidden them to marry and sequestrated them from all suitors, in consequence of an ambiguous warning from the oracle of Delphi. The princes, however, by a stratagem, have obtained access to the ladies, proved their own identity (which is otherwise secret), and arranged an elopement. But their plans go astray, and all four lovers are arrested under circumstances strongly suggesting a conspiracy between them and the queen, Gynecia, to murder Basilius, who has been found apparently dead. The rule of the kingdom devolves upon Philanax, and he, with the consent of the nobles, invites Euarchus, a king celebrated for his wisdom and equity, to preside over the trial of the princes on charges of regicide and abduction.

Dr. Rowe does his best to sharpen the conflict between love and obedience into a dilemma. He insists strongly that the princes are exemplary

[1] K. T. Rowe, 'Romantic Love and Parental Authority in Sidney's *Arcadia*' (Univ. of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology Ann Arbor, 1947).

NOTES

A HUNDRED-NAME

A CORRESPONDENT recently consulted me about the strange name *Kiftsgate* in Gloucestershire. I could only refer him to the explanation given by O. S. Anderson (Arngart) in *English Hundred-Names*, vol. ii, but the query directed my attention again to the name and aroused my interest in its etymology. I found that an alternative explanation may be worthy of consideration.

The hundred forms the north-eastern portion of Gloucestershire and is the district of Winchcombe and Chipping Campden. The meeting-place was at Kiftsgate on the edge of the hill west of Chipping Campden. The name appears as *Cheftesihat* 1086 DB, *Keftes-*, *Kiftesgatehundredum* 1183 ff. P, *Kyftesgate* 1220 Fees, *Kuftesgate* 1227 ff. Pat, *Kiftegate* 1251 Pat (Anderson, op. cit., pp. 18 f.).

According to Anderson the first element is possibly an OE. **cyft* 'hill', derived from the root **kub* 'to curve' and related to OE. *cȳf* 'tub' and the like. The same element is possibly found in *Kefthulle* (p) 1327 Subsidy Roll for Hants; the person is recorded under Northington.

This etymology is intrinsically unexceptionable and it suits the local conditions. But *cyft* is unrecorded in English and without parallel in other Germanic languages, and there is an alternative explanation according to which *cyft* would be a counterpart of a word well evidenced in Continental Germanic and with a meaning which would suit a hundred-name.

I suggest that **cyft* is a derivative with a *ti*-suffix from OE. *cuman* 'to come', corresponding to OHG. *qhuumft*, *cumft*, *cunft*, MHG. *kunft* 'coming'. The same base is found in Gothic *gaqumps* f. 'meeting, conference', rendering Greek *συναγωγή*, *συνέδριον*. A corresponding word with a voiced fricative due to Verner's law is ON. *samkund* 'meeting'.

The base would be PrGmc. **kwumpi-*, whence PrE. **kumfti-* or the like, later **kūfti-* and OE. **cȳft*. An analogous case is OE. *sēfte* 'soft' from **samftia-*, corresponding to OHG. *samfti*, OSax. *sâfte* (*sâfto* adv.), the base being apparently PrGmc. **sampia-*.

If my suggestion is correct, the OE. word must have been a counterpart of Gothic *gaqumps*, an OE. **gecȳft* with the meaning 'meeting, conference'. The hundred-name would mean 'gate where meetings were held'. The suitability of such a name is a point in favour of the theory.

The usual form *Kiftes-* with the masculine or neuter genitival ending *-es* indicates that the OE. **gecȳft* was a neuter noun like many other old

feminines with the prefix *ge-*, as *gecynd*, *genyht* (Sievers-Brunner, *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, § 267 b).

The usual word for 'coming' is OE. *cyme*, but Old English may have had two words with this meaning; cf. OHG. *kumi* by the side of *kunft*. But the word* *gecȳft* may be a specially Gloucestershire one. The county belonged to the old territory of the Hwicce, whose vocabulary may have included words not recorded in other dialect areas. For another possibly Hwiccian word reference may be made to my book *Studies on English Place-names* (1936), p. 61 (OE. *sūlig* 'pigsty'). But if *Kefthulle* of 1327 contains the word **gecȳft* and means 'assembly hill', the word would have been used also in Hants.

EILERT EKWALL

THE TRIAL OF THE PRINCES IN THE *ARCADIA*, BOOK V

THE trial in which Sidney's *Arcadia* culminates raises questions vital to the understanding of the author's purpose. Yet the only critical discussion of the trial, that of Dr. Rowe,[1] is carried out only in terms of a conflict between romantic love and parental authority—a conflict which may be, as Dr. Rowe claims, 'one of the most pervasive and significant themes in Elizabethan literature and society' but is certainly far from exhausting the significance of the passage.

The circumstances, it will be remembered, are that the heroes, Pyrocles and Musidorus, after a period of knight-errantry in Asia Minor, have come to Arcadia and there become enamoured of two princesses, Pamela and Philoclea, whose father Basilius, king of Arcadia, has forbidden them to marry and sequestrated them from all suitors, in consequence of an ambiguous warning from the oracle of Delphi. The princes, however, by a stratagem, have obtained access to the ladies, proved their own identity (which is otherwise secret), and arranged an elopement. But their plans go astray, and all four lovers are arrested under circumstances strongly suggesting a conspiracy between them and the queen, Gynecia, to murder Basilius, who has been found apparently dead. The rule of the kingdom devolves upon Philanax, and he, with the consent of the nobles, invites Euarchus, a king celebrated for his wisdom and equity, to preside over the trial of the princes on charges of regicide and abduction.

Dr. Rowe does his best to sharpen the conflict between love and obedience into a dilemma. He insists strongly that the princes are exemplary

[1] K. T. Rowe, 'Romantic Love and Parental Authority in Sidney's *Arcadia*' (Univ. of Michigan Contributions in Modern Philology 4, Ann Arbor, 1947).

characters, so that whatever Sidney makes them do cannot have been wrong in his eyes. On the other hand, their actions are certainly in conflict with the rights of parental authority, which Sidney also approves in terms too explicit to be treated as an unthinking reflection of current opinion.

> The inconsistency of the treatment of love and marriage in the *Arcadia* is a reflection of the unity of its author's enthusiasm for virtue and beauty of human conduct as manifested in the varied forms characteristic of his age.[1]

In what form of argument, however, unity can be reflected in an inconsistency is not clear, and it does seem that a further consequence of Dr. Rowe's argument is to credit Sidney, whose intellectual power is displayed on every page of his work, with a muddled mind.

Apart from this difficulty, however, Dr. Rowe would also have to explain why, if this conflict was Sidney's main concern, he placed so little stress on the figures of the princesses, whose conduct raises these questions far more acutely than that of the heroes. Moreover—and here Sidney escapes from the dilemma on which Dr. Rowe seeks to impale him—one must not treat the 1593 version of the *Arcadia* as if it were all of a piece. The exemplary value of the heroes belongs to the *New Arcadia*; the trial belongs substantially to the *Old*. Even if the revisions made to the latter by the Countess of Pembroke conform to Sidney's probable intentions (as Dr. Rowe has given reasons to believe),[2] we can be sure they do not exhaust his intentions. To judge by his own rewriting of the earlier part, there would have been continuous, minute revision of style and tone and probably additions to the plot as well as the Countess's slight modifications of it. One cannot simply transfer to the heroes of the *New Arcadia* the moral judgements passed upon the considerably different Pyrocles and Musidorus of the original version. Let us see first where, in reading the trial passage, interest seems to be directed.

By the time the princes appear before Euarchus, Gynecia has already, overwhelmed with remorse, confessed (though not truly) to the murder of the king; the charge of regicide against the princes is therefore not pressed, and Euarchus finally regards it as not proven. What they are charged with, therefore, is that they masqueraded under false identities, ingratiated themselves with the two nearest heirs to the throne, and persuaded the latter to elope with them in defiance of Basilius's paternal and royal authority.

> Who sees not that these dark webs of effeminate Princes be dangerous forerunners of innovations, even in a quiet, and equally tempered people?[3]

[1] Rowe, op. cit., p. 58.
[2] See articles in *P.M.L.A.*, liv (1939), 122–38, and in *M.P.*, xxxvii (1939), 151–72.
[3] Fulke Greville, *Life of Sidney*, ed. Nowell Smith (1907), p. 13.

At this time of day it is hardly necessary to argue for the authority of Greville as an interpreter of his friend's work. But even without this passage so fortunately at hand, the ideals of kingship and courtiership are so clearly dominant in the *Arcadia* that princes and princesses can never be regarded as merely exalted individuals. The issue is not whether a young girl can run off with a lover against her father's wishes, but whether the heiress of a kingdom can do so to the endangering of the constitution; and this point is emphasized by the simultaneous death of Basilius, which converts what might have been a purely theoretical uncertainty about the succession into an urgent practical question on which the Arcadian state comes close to shipwreck.

> For nowe theyr Prince and guide had lefte them, they had not experience to rule, and had not whome to obaye.[1]

And not only does Sidney, in these words, go out of his way to point the moral that, under a childless queen, was never far from the thoughts of any practical politician of his day; he devotes several pages to a detailed analysis of different courses of action advocated by the several factions in the Arcadian assembly. The sole preoccupation of Philanax and Euarchus is to punish those who have subverted the order of society and to get the constitution working again.

This explains the sternness of their proceedings. Dr. Rowe makes a problem of the ferocity with which Philanax prosecutes the princes, and provides a solution to it by reference to the established tradition of prosecution oratory; but Philanax's vituperation is only part of the difficulty to be faced by the sentimental. For Euarchus, in the end, is no whit behind him in mercilessness. It is also clear that he is acting against his own feelings, especially after he learns that the accused are his son and nephew. He, even more than Philanax, is the slave of a severe law, and, being called in as a stranger to administer it, has no conceivable discretion or prerogative of mercy. He wins Sidney's warmest praise by carrying out his duty and refusing to tamper with the basis of society for the benefit of two young men who have most imprudently got themselves into a false position, and indeed he is the only character in the *Old Arcadia* who is exemplary in the manner of the *New*.

And yet, and yet—he comes within an ace of causing a most intolerable miscarriage of justice. The real dilemma of the trial arises not from the conduct of the accused, but from that of the judge. If Euarchus's severity can be defended only by reference to the disorganization of the state caused by the king's supposed death, then we have to face either the repulsive proposition that the guilt of the accused can be aggravated by a

[1] *Works of Sidney*, ed. Feuillerat, ii. 130.

circumstance they know nothing about and are not responsible for or else the doctrine that where the existence of the state is at stake injustice to individuals does not matter. Now in the section on providence in Philippe Mornay's *Woorke concerning the trewnesse of the Christian Religion*, which Sidney had begun to translate before his death, we find, as it happens, an answer to a very similar problem, together with an example in terms rather like the situation of Pyrocles and Musidorus. Mornay first states the difficulty, the prevalence of unjust condemnation, then answers it:

> What a number of good folke doe we see put to the slaughter, not onely good in the iudgement of vs, but also euen in the iudgement of those that put them to death? Nay rather, what is death but the common passage which it behoueth vs al to pass? And what great matter makes it, whether thou passe it by Sea or by Land? by the corruption of thyne owne humours, or by the corruptnesse of thy Commonweale? Agayne, how often haue Iudges condemned some man for a cryme, whereof he hath bene giltlesse, and in the denyall whereof he hath stood euen vpon the Scaffold, and yet hath there confessed himself faultie in some other cryme? . . . As for example, the Iudge condemneth them for conspiracie against the commonweale, whereas God condemneth them (perchaunce) for behauing themselues loosely in defending the commonweale.[1]

Something like Mornay's doctrine seems to have been Sidney's, however little we may like the fact. When the princes, awaiting their trial, compose themselves for their fate, saying that they have achieved the end of their lives,[2] they are in fact minimizing the importance of death just as Mornay does, and although they are innocent of the crime alleged against them, they are not blameless in other respects. Christian feeling of great warmth replaces in Sidney the philosophical calm that gives Mornay's argument a Stoic colouring; but the doctrinal substance is essentially the same. Both tend to minimize the importance of accidental injustices, and both are quite clear that the individual who suffers them has no right to complain.

The course of the trial thus seems to raise issues, and to reveal confusions, more formidable than matters of personal ethics—issues, indeed, that were fundamental to the political theory of the sixteenth century. Here, however, one must emphasize that this conclusion relates only to the *Old Arcadia*, and can by no means, as remarked above, be transferred to the *New Arcadia*. What the revised trial would have been like we have virtually no evidence. We can perhaps be fairly sure that the supremacy of *raison d'état* would have been maintained over the princes' private aims, however blameless; we cannot be at all sure that it would have been so maintained as to raise these particular questions. D. M. ANDERSON

[1] Philippe Mornay du Plessis, *A Woorke concerning the trewnesse of the Christian Religion* (London, 1587), pp. 193–4.

[2] *Works*, ii. 164.

JAMES SHIRLEY'S YEARS OF SERVICE

AMONG the Chancery Town Depositions in the Public Record Office there is one made by James Shirley (C24/425/20) which throws light on his activities between June 1612 and April 1615, the period which G. E. Bentley (*The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, v (London, 1956), p. 1065) calls the 'puzzling gap' in our knowledge of Shirley's career. It goes far to discredit the tradition established by Anthony à Wood (*Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, iii. 737) that he was at St. John's, Oxford, before proceeding to Cambridge, for Shirley declares that for two of the two and three-quarter years in question he was 'servant' to Thomas Frith, scrivener.

Frith, who had a 'dwelling house . . . in Cornehill'[1] and a shop 'on the back syde of the Exchange',[2] put out other people's money at interest, usually securing a bond from the borrower ensuring repayment by a certain date. His failure and imprisonment about Michaelmas 1614 gave rise to a number of Chancery suits in which many of his earlier transactions were called into question. It was for the first of these suits that Shirley came down from Catherine Hall, Cambridge, on 6 March 1615/16 to depose on behalf of John Crookes, one of Frith's most pathetic victims.

Crookes, a yeoman of Romford, Essex, had needed one hundred pounds in ready money in February 1611/12. He got it from Samuel Tryon and Peter Le Mayre through Frith. His sureties were Thomas Gouge of Stratford Bowe, gentleman, and Thomas Pollard. All three of them bound themselves in a penal bond to pay one hundred and five pounds to Le Mayre before 7 August 1612. The money was repaid on time to Frith, who promised to return their bond as soon as he could get it from Le Mayre. Frith then made other use of the money, so that although Le Mayre was informed that the loan had been repaid, he retained the bond. In two or three subsequent transactions with Tryon and Le Mayre, Frith specifically requested the bond; it was not returned, however; and immediately after Frith's failure, Le Mayre put it into execution at the Guildhall.

[1] P.R.O. C2Jas I/C24/54.

[2] P.R.O. C24/438/32 Deposition of Thomas Legat. Frith, the son of George Frith of Rainham, Essex, had been a 'Scholar in the Free scole at Upminster', Essex, and was admitted to the Scriveners' Company on 11 April 1595. In 1611 he was chosen as an Assistant of the Company. He was married to his stepsister, Elizabeth Holden, and by February 1610/11 they had four sons and a daughter: Robert, Gregory, George, James, and Johan. Robert, though little more than an infant, was married to his cousin, Anne Goldan. George and James entered the Scriveners' Company in 1630 and 1638 respectively. C24/425/20, C24/438/32, C24/438/34, C24/439/unnumbered Depositions of Thomas Gregorie, Richard Glover, Thomas Purfoote, William Frith, Daniel de Ligne, Thomas Gouge, George Coney, and Thomas Hill. C33/127/35, 126, 488. Guildhall L37/MS5370, the 'Common Paper' of the Scriveners' Company, f. 50; L37/MS8721A (a photostat of Bodleian MS. Rawlinson D51), the Scriveners' Company Charter and Ordinance Book, ff. 63, 65, 68, 69 (Rawl. D51, ff. 27–30).

In April 1615 Crookes and his two sureties countered by exhibiting a Bill of Complaint in the Court of Chancery against Frith, Tryon, and Le Mayre. Neither their Bill nor the defendants' Answer is extant, but the depositions which grew out of them are. Crookes tried to establish that Le Mayre and Tryon commonly trusted Frith with the receipt as well as the letting of their monies, so that by the repayment the bond should in equity have been cancelled. Thomas Gregorie and Richard Glover, Frith's apprentices, testified to this effect; but in a subsequent suit it was determined that such evidence was insufficient in point of law to free Crookes from his obligation.[1]

The text of Shirley's deposition reads:[2]

6° Marcij 1615 Anno Jacobi R xiij°

1. James Sherley of Katherine Hall in Camebridge gent of the age of 19 yeares or thereabouts sworne & examined &c That he doth knowe Thomas Gouge gent named for one of the Complainants and thinketh he doth knowe John Crookes named for an other Complainant in this suyte and doth also knowe the three defendants Samuell Tryon Peter Le Mayre and Thomas Frith but Thomas Pollard named for one other of the Complainants in the title of the interrogatories he sayeth he knoweth not, And sayeth he hath known Mr Crookes & Mr Gouge these three yeares or thereabouts and the defendants Samuell Tryon and Peter Le Mayre much about so long tyme and Thomas Frith these fower yeares or thereabouts.

2. That by being servant heretofore to the said Thomas Frith this deponent doth knowe that he the said Frith did vse to put forth the money of other men to interest and amongest the rest did put out dyvers summes of moneyes which were the moneyes of the said Samuell Tryon and Peter Le Mayre of this deponents owne certen knowledge, But howe longe or howe many tymes the said Frith soe did put out theyr or eyther of theire said moneyes this deponent saith he knoweth not.

3. That it was a thinge usuall with the said Frith during the tyme of this deponents being with him which was about two yeares or neere thereabouts to receave such moneyes or most parte thereof as he did soe put forth for any of them that had dealing with him his Credditt was soe good.

Shirley further testifies that he is ignorant how far Tryon and Le Mayre trusted Frith, and that he neither knows about the procurement or repayment of the loan in question, nor whether there had been dealings since the repayment between Tryon and Le Mayre, and Frith.

10. . .onely this deponent remembreth that he hath heard Mr Frith whilest this deponent was his servant saye that he was to haue certen summes of money

[1] C2Jas I C24/54; C24/425/20 *passim*; C33/127/1163; C33/133/478. Gregorie was with Frith at least until June 1613, and was familiar with his subsequent affairs; Glover joined him some time late in 1612.

[2] I have expanded the contractions.

(howe much this deponent remembreth not) of Mr Tryon to whoe he the said Frith had mortgaged certen lands. [signed] James Sherley

This document raises a number of issues concerning the relation between Shirley and the other people involved in the suit. He met Frith a year before he met the others, and may have done so merely because the Merchant Taylors' School which he attended was only a few hundred yards from Cornhill and the Royal Exchange where Frith lived and carried on his business.[1] He appears not to have renewed his contact with any of these people when he returned to London in 1625 after an absence of ten years.[2] There is also the question of Shirley's precise status. While Gregorie and Glover each describes himself at first as 'apprentice' and later as 'servant', Shirley calls himself 'servant' throughout. This, taken together with his general ignorance of Frith's affairs—he knew so little that he was not called upon to testify in any of the other cases in which Frith was involved[3]—might imply employment in Frith's home rather than his shop.

Shirley's two years with Frith include most of the period which has previously remained unaccounted for, but the evidence is inconclusive as to the exact dates. If we assume that Frith ceased to employ him about the time of his failure and imprisonment, then Shirley's service would have begun about Michaelmas 1612, three months after Dyce concludes that he left Merchant Taylors' School. On the other hand, according to the testimony of Gregorie, Glover, and Shirley himself, Frith did considerable business with Tryon and Le Mayre, so that it would seem reasonable to date Shirley's employment from the time that he became acquainted with them. He declares that he had known them for about three years in March 1615/16, which suggests that he worked for Frith from early 1613 till early 1615. None of his other answers provides a more definite date.[4]

Were we to accept the earlier dates, we should leave the period from October 1614 to April 1615 still unaccounted for. By accepting the later period, we leave blank the months from June 1612 until January or

[1] A John Frith had been admitted to the School in 1575 (*A Register of the Scholars Admitted to the Merchant Taylors' School*), but he was the son of Humphrey Frith.

[2] See the works of Nason, Baugh, and Stevenson cited by Bentley, op. cit. 'One Frith a scrivener', in prison for debt, 'dispatcht himself with a pistoll' in March 1618/19 (*The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. N. E. McClure (Philadelphia, 1939) ii. 223). The Decree and Order Book of the Court of Chancery confirms that Frith was dead by 5 June 1619 (C33/135/1088).

[3] There is no other deposition by Shirley among the Town Depositions cited, and the indexes to the Depositions by Commission, i.e. those taken outside London, do not refer to Frith's cases.

[4] The 'summes of money' in the tenth answer could refer to a transaction in February 1614/15 when Tryon, pursuant to an Order of Chancery of 14 January, purchased the property which Frith had previously mortgaged to him, or to an earlier one in January 1612/13 (C24/425/20, C24/439/unnumbered Depositions of Thomas Gregorie).

February 1613. It is possible, of course, that 'about two yeares or neere thereabouts' need not be limited so strictly to twenty-four months, and that Shirley was associated with Frith for almost the whole of the period under consideration. In any case, he could not have been a student at Oxford for more than two terms, and was probably never there at all.

J. P. FEIL

SOME ANNOTATIONS IN THE SECOND EARL OF OXFORD'S COPIES OF POPE'S *EPISTLE TO DR. ARBUTHNOT* AND *SOBER ADVICE FROM HORACE*

AMONG the manuscript annotations in the second Earl of Oxford's copies of Pope's poems, now in the Bodleian Library,[1] there are a few which I think deserve closer inspection than they have so far received. Three of these occur in the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*, and one in *Sober Advice from Horace*.

The first note to which I wish to call attention has been entered beside the portrait of 'Atticus':

> The assertion of some anonymous Authors that M^r^ P. writ this Character after the Gentlemans death, was utterly untrue; it having been sent him several years before ~~on a Provoca-~~ ~~he has too much regard to his memory to~~ ~~tion of that nature, wch (unless obligd to it) we wd not per-~~ ~~petuate~~: and then shown to M^r^ Secretary Crags, & ye present Earl of Burlington; who approvd our Author's Conduct on he has too much regard to that Gentlemans memory an Occasion ~~wch out of regard to his Memory to perpetuate~~ willingly to make publick.
> By what accident it came into print, he never could learn, but [a]~~All~~ he can now do is to omit the Name.

Courthope, in his introduction to the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*, quotes the undeleted parts of this note, but gives no indication that what he quotes is not the whole, and attributes it to Lord Oxford.[2] More recently, Norman Ault has quoted in his 'Pope and Addison' a portion of the undeleted matter, but again with no indication that the note has been revised, and with the usual attribution to Lord Oxford.[3] Neither writer expresses surprise that

[1] Shelf-mark M 3. 19. Art.

[2] Pope's *Works*, ed. W. Elwin and W. J. Courthope (10 vols., London, 1871–89), iii. 233. Courthope misprints *had* for *has* and *regard for* for *regard to*. Hereafter referred to as *E.-C.*

[3] *R.E.S.*, xvii (1941), 437. See also his *New Light on Pope* (London, 1949), p. 112.

Lord Oxford should have been at such pains to phrase a marginal jotting in his private copy, as if for public consumption. Nor does either writer remark that this particular jotting is in a different hand from most of the others, so that if the rest are in Lord Oxford's hand, as they quite evidently are, this one cannot be.[1]

The fact is, I believe, that the note is Pope's. For one thing, as nearly as I can ascertain, it is in Pope's hand, though this is admittedly a difficult point to be sure of. For another, it is rather obviously a trial run for the note that Pope printed with this passage in the folio and quarto editions of his *Works . . . Volume II* in 1735:

> It was a great Falshood which some of the Libels reported, that this Character was written after the Gentleman's death, which see refuted in the Testimonies prefix'd to the Dunciad. But the occasion of writing it was such, as he could not make publick in regard to his memory; and all that could further be done was to omit the Name, in the Editions of his Works.

Moreover, it makes sense for Pope to be taking pains like these with the wording of a remark about his verses on Addison, as it hardly does for Lord Oxford.

Pope was understandably sensitive about the charge that he had written the 'Atticus' lines after Addison's death. The story derived a factitious plausibility from the fact that the verses were not published till 1722 (Addison died in 1719), and did not, apparently, gain either much attention or public association with Pope till they were republished in expanded form in the Pope–Swift *Miscellanies* ('The Last Volume') of March 1728.[2] The charge was made by a writer in *Mist's Journal*, 8 June 1728, following the publication of the *Dunciad* in May; and Pope was quick to deny it in the 'Testimonies of Authors' of the *Dunciad Variorum* (April 1729). There he invoked the authority of 'those persons of integrity, who several years before Mr. Addison's decease did see and approve of the said verses, in no wise a libel, but a friendly rebuke sent privately in our author's own hand to Mr. Addison himself', and named specifically as warrant for his statement the Earl of Burlington.[3]

What happened in 1735, on the publication of a still farther expanded version of the lines in the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot*, was, one may surmise, a repetition of this: the reprinting of the lines provoked among Pope's enemies fresh outbreaks of the accusation,[4] and Pope, aware of such

[1] Lord Oxford's hand is easily distinguishable from Pope's.

[2] Ault gives a full account of the several versions in the works cited above.

[3] *The Dunciad*, ed. James Sutherland (London, 1943), pp. 32–33.

[4] This statement is frankly speculative. The charge was regularly made between 1728 and 1734, but I have not found any instance of it in the months between the publication of the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* and the publication of the *Works* of 1735.

rumours, or anticipating them, began to jot down a disclaimer to be printed in the next edition. In composing the manuscript note, he decided to mention by name two witnesses of his good faith (though Craggs was dead and could not testify), and to hint, so I understand it, that continued misrepresentations on this subject might eventually force him to retaliate by divulging the sorry story of Addison's participation in Tickell's translation of Homer.[1] In the printed note, on the other hand, for reasons possibly so various that it is useless to speculate about them, he elected to refer only to the refutation already extant in the 'Testimonies' of the *Dunciad*, and, for the rest, to take the dignified stand which had been explicit from the start in the lines themselves: that injuries done by one so admirable on other counts should not be matter for resentment but lament.[2]

The fact that this note appears in Lord Oxford's copy of the poem offers no serious obstacle to its being accepted as Pope's. Oxford's copy of the *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* was almost certainly presented by the author, who wrote promising him the poem on 30 December 1734.[3] And it is perfectly plausible that Pope should have sent his friend, either by inadvertence or intent, a copy which he had already started to 'correct' toward the new edition that was speedily to be published in his *Works . . . Volume II*, in April 1735. Indeed, there are two other manuscript insertions in Lord Oxford's copy which I take to be by Pope.

The first of these is a couplet added to the portrait of the patron 'Bufo', between ll. 234 and 235:

> To Bards reciting he vouchsafd a Nod
> And snuff'd their Incence like a gracious God.

This couplet is also in Pope's hand, so far as I can determine. It was known to Courthope as occurring 'in the MS.'[4] of this epistle, but is not otherwise known. Its insertion in Lord Oxford's copy, where none of the other manuscript variants is found, suggests once more that Pope, intentionally or otherwise, sent to Oxford a copy of the epistle that he had begun to correct.

The second instance occurs at lines 305 and 309. Before 'Let Sporus tremble' in l. 305, a capital 'P' has been inserted—also, I think, in Pope's

[1] Told in full in Ault's *New Light*, ch. vi.

[2] In what is probably the earliest version of the lines on Addison, the closing couplet makes no mention of laughter:

> Who but must Grieve, if such a One there Be,
> Who would not Weep, if Addison were He?

[3] *E.-C.*, viii. 309.

[4] Presumably the Chauncy MS., which *E.-C.* cites for many variants in this poem. The location of this manuscript is now unknown.

hand—and before 'What?' in the same line, the word 'Dr', i.e. Arbuthnot. At the beginning of l. 309, where Pope again becomes the speaker after Arbuthnot's three and a half lines of protest, the 'P' is repeated. These are trifling alterations, yet interesting because they may show Pope commencing, in a limited way, and as yet only with the aim of perspicuity, the transformation of this epistle into dialogue, which Warburton, with or without authority, consummated in the edition of 1751.

II

Beside l. 121 of his copy of *Sober Advice from Horace*, Lord Oxford has written a gloss which seems to have escaped the attention of Pope's editors. The passage has to do with the alacrity with which amorous fools will search out charms and overlook faults in mistresses, and the line compares their blindness to that of one 'Ty—y': 'To all defects, Ty—y not so blind.'

Courthope and the Twickenham editor identify this as an allusion to James O'Hara, second Baron Tyrawley (1690–1773), ambassador to Portugal from 1728 till 1741, and, later, to Russia.[1] The identification is plausible because Tyrawley was apparently 'singularly licentious, even for the courts of Russia and Portugal';[2] and Walpole wrote to Mann when Tyrawley returned from Lisbon in 1742: 'My Lord Tyrawley is come from Portugal, and has brought three wives and fourteen children; one of the former is a Portuguese with long black hair plaited down to the bottom of her back.'[3] Such a man might well be cited as blind to defects.

But a quite different interpretation is put upon this allusion by Lord Oxford. His note says: 'Lady Tyrawley very near sighted.' On the face of it, this seems unpersuasive: the licence of an ambassador would be more likely to claim Pope's attention than the near-sightedness of a woman. Recently, however, I have come upon the following anecdote in an unpublished notebook of Horace Walpole's:

> Lady Tyrawley was extremely blind, but wou'd never own it; She wou'd curtsie to a Post, & take it ill the Lady did not return her curtsie. She went one Day to see Lady Sundon, & over the Chimney was the Picture of a Shock Dog; she woud needs be seeing, & pointed to the picture with a smile of approbation; prodigiously like my Lord Sundon! Besides a deal of natural Squinting, She had damaged her Eyes with the Loads of White she us'd, which at last from want of Sight She Us'd to confound with her Red, & lay them on just in their wrong Places. One Day She came into Lady Sunderlands with this plaister'd Countenance,

[1] The poem is not printed by *E.-C.*, but the Tyrawley allusion is commented on at iii. 326, in connexion with Pope's allusion to 'Ty—y's crew', l. 121 of his imitation of the sixth epistle of the first book of Horace.

[2] Le Marchant's phrase, in his edition of Horace Walpole's *Memoirs of . . . George III* (London, 1845), i. 144 n.

[3] 15 November 1742.

stif Eyes & childish Air. A little Girl of Lady Sunderland's took her for a Baby, & wanted to have her to play with: pointed positively with one forefinger & cried, Doll! Doll![1]

Either of two Lady Tyrawleys may have been intended in this anecdote: Francis Rouse, mother of the ambassador, who died in 1733, or Mary Stewart, his wife, who died in 1769. The tone and tense of the story; its occurrence in a notebook dated 1740, which seems to contain no entry later than 1763; the absence of the second Lady Tyrawley for so many years in Portugal, suggest that the elder woman is meant. In any case, however, it seems clear from this anecdote that the near-sightedness of Lady Tyrawley was known in the circles in which Pope moved,[2] and that Oxford's interpretation is either the correct one, or, at any rate, part of a double allusion to the 'blindness', in varying senses, of mother and son, or wife and husband.

MAYNARD MACK

CORRESPONDENCE

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

Sir,

Professor R. C. Bald has brought to my attention two important corrections of my transcription of Edward Alleyn's draft letter to John Donne, published in *R.E.S.*, N.S. vi (1955), 365–71. (1) Alleyn's draft is written on the blank parts of a letter to him that is signed 'W^{m}: Becher thelder' [th'elder], not 'W^{m}: Becherchelder'. (2) The interlined words referring to the Blackfriars, 'as the plaiehowse theare', are one of J. P. Collier's forgeries. For the latter point Mr. Bald gives the references: G. F. Warner, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts at Dulwich College*, p. 115, and E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare, a Study of Facts and Problems*, ii. 390. Neither of these alterations affects the letter itself as printed, however.

Mr. Bald also disagrees on several word readings, some of which I had designated as uncertain at best. As for the others, on rechecking my photostat of the manuscript, I find that I still disagree with his alternative readings, but I feel that they should be printed as showing another possibility in what is certainly an extremely crabbed handwriting. Mr. Bald's readings are:

p. 367. Line 5 of letter what *instead of* when

[1] 'A Commonplace Book of Verses, Stories, Characters, Letters, &c., &c., with some particular Memoirs of a certain Parcel of People', p. 16. I am grateful to the owner, Mr. W. S. Lewis, of Farmington, Connecticut, for permission to use this material.

[2] Walpole, as is well known, lived in Twickenham, and may have heard these stories there. Lady Sundon was Woman of the Bedchamber to Queen Caroline, and hence a familiar of several court acquaintances of Pope's.

Although Alleyn's final *n* resembles his final *t*, I tend to agree with Mr. Bald's reading.

l. 13. revew revers

Alleyn's *w* and his *r* are almost always clearly differentiated. Here the *ers* seems particularly clear. The word 'reverse' meaning 'to bring back to mind' is a perfectly good usage. See *O.E.D.*, under *Reverse* v.[1], 1. a, 1590 example (Spenser).

l. 21. 500[l] more 500[l]

My own manuscript includes the word 'more', which is certainly in the letter. I must have missed the omission in the proof at the turn of the line.

l. 24. mark markes
l. 30. mark markes

In both cases the contraction line is quite clear.

p. 368, l. 8. brock breck

This, it seems to me, is a matter of choice, to be decided ultimately by outside evidence.

p. 369, l. 4. y[e] peple all y[e] poynt off

The *p*, *o*, *y*, and *t* of one word are quite clear, and there can be little question of the last word's being 'off' even though the bottom halves of the *f*'s are quite faint.

l. 6. sadle selfe

This word is obscure enough for either reading. I would say Mr. Bald's *d* is probably more accurate than my *f*.

l. 19. w[t] silenc w[t] labour

As I indicated by my bracketed question mark, I honestly do not know what word this is. The final *our* can be checked against several similar constructions in the letter and seems to me undeniable.

l. 21. w[t] to

Because of the possibility of fading ink, either one of these readings could be correct and could be verified by checking against other words in the letter. If the ink has not faded, 'to' is correct; if it has faded, 'w[t]' is correct.

BAIRD W. WHITLOCK

REVIEWS

An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England. By PETER HUNTER BLAIR. Pp. xvi + 382. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 30*s.* net.

There are many people who will be glad to see this book. Perhaps one of its greatest advantages is that it is exactly the sort of book which can be put into the hands of the student who is faced with those Old English texts which in most universities are considered a proper part of an English Honours course. In days gone by these texts were too often treated as a kind of happy hunting ground for philologists. The result was that those students who had no taste for philology—and that means the great majority—were completely put off by them, and unfortunately some universities took the easy way out and removed Old English studies from their Honours courses. But increasingly of late, teachers have discovered that if the student is really given a background to enable him to understand and appreciate Old English poetry and prose, the effort of what seems like learning a fresh language is lightened, his interest is stimulated, and he realizes that he is in a position to appreciate the nearest approach to a true epic poem, the finest battle poem, and one of the finest religious poems in our language—for Old English after all *is* our language.

This book, then, is intended as a general introduction to the life, literature, thought, and artistic activities of the English people from the latter part of the Roman occupation to the beginning of the Norman Age. It begins with the study of the last days of Roman Britain, the Welsh and English invasions, the establishment of the English kingdoms and their gradual unification. Then follows a very much compressed but lucid account of England under Viking rule up to the Norman Conquest. The four chapters which take up more than two-thirds of the book are devoted to the history of the Church, the government of the country, the economy of the town and countryside, and lastly the growth of the language, and its orthography, as well as its scholarship and the growth of learning under the new monasticism.

Mr. Blair needed courage to sit down and write a book which covers so wide a field. As he himself points out in the Preface, 'the period is too long and the evidence too diverse for any one person to be able to take a firm grasp of the whole'. But though of course the specialist will find points of disagreement here and there, yet Mr. Blair is a specialist himself in so many fields of Anglo-Saxon studies that few readers will find much to cavil at. It is true that the book lacks footnotes, but for the non-specialist, for whom it is primarily intended, a multitude of footnotes are a source of confusion, and the bibliography to some extent makes up for their absence. Footnotes are added, however, when even the reader familiar with the period may not be aware of some piece of modern research, especially when it happens to be in some foreign periodical not easily available in England. This is the case with the Trelleborg excavations which have been taking place since 1934 in Western Sjaelland and have produced remarkable

results. Mr. Blair has also drawn attention to three other Viking fortresses of the same type which are still being excavated in Denmark.

It is Mr. Blair's interest in and knowledge of field work and the more practical side of archaeology which adds greatly to the interest of the book. Thus he can speak with authority of the last days of Roman Britain, because he has himself had a share in some of the important work which has been done on Romano-British sites in the north of England during the last twenty-five years. His lucid and succinct account of the Anglo-Saxon invasions is obviously the work of a man who has studied the problems at first hand and on the site. This practical interest runs through the book and enables him to deal adequately with such subjects as Anglo-Saxon architecture, jewellery, and sculpture. For this very reason one greatly regrets that more space was not devoted to the Sutton Hoo treasure, which has completely revolutionized our ideas on many problems of art history, not only in East Anglia but also in Northumbria and Kent. But Mr. Blair has comparatively little to say on the subject. Nor are the striking Swedish associations dealt with by more than one or two vague comments. On the whole the pagan grave finds receive disappointingly little attention. It is one of the inevitable results of the width of Mr. Blair's range that his decisions as to what can best be omitted for reasons of space are bound to meet with some criticism.

There are places where Mr. Blair's general conclusions are open to question, such as that on p. 313 where he says: 'Anglo-Saxon handwriting of the eighth century plainly reveals its descent from the Irish form of the Latin alphabet, not from the seventh-century Italian hand.' Or again his remark on p. 305 that the Latin alphabet was learnt from the Irish 'as may be seen from the form in which they [the Anglo-Saxons] wrote it'. A good many palaeographers would boggle at both these statements. Perhaps his own comment on p. 319 about the illuminated Gospels sums up the situation as regards the origin of the Insular script too: 'To regard [it] as being particularly English or particularly Irish is to misunderstand the peculiar nature of that Northumbrian civilization. . . .' Or again on p. 254, referring to Guthlac's famous encounter with the devils talking British, he says: 'The incident does not refer to the East Anglian Fens at all, but to a Welsh raid into Mercia.' But the incident happened in the East Anglian Fens at Crowland. In any case it is as rash to interpret it as a Welsh raid as it is to make it refer to the survival of the British in the Fen district. The incident is told in Guthlac's Life as one of a series of devil fights, and has no value whatever as historical evidence. The only deduction we can draw from it is that Guthlac had at some time and somewhere come into close contact with the Welsh, and that Felix did not like either them or their language.

There are a few points which need to be looked into, and possibly corrected in a later edition. Mr. Blair, for instance, has followed Sir Frank Stenton in dating certain seventh-century events, including the Council of Whitby, a year earlier than historians have usually done; but he occasionally strays back to the older dating. Thus on p. 50 the battle of Hatfield Chase and Oswald's victory over Cadwallon are dated in the years 633 and 634 respectively in one paragraph, and 632 and 633 in the next. On p. 128 the date of the latter becomes 634 and on p. 158

reverts to 633 again. On p. 137 Mr. Blair attributes Wilfrid's visit to Frisia to a storm, following Bede (*H.E.*, v. 19). On p. 163 he attributes it to political reasons, following Eddius (c. 26). The latter is almost certainly the real reason. On p. 138 Eata is described as having being made 'prior' instead of abbot of Lindisfarne. On pp. 85 and 139 there are references to Durham County which are unnecessary and misleading seeing that the county did not properly come into existence till after the Conquest. On p. 158, the term 'long-and-short' (as Baldwin Brown says in *Arts in Early England*, ii (1925 edn.), p. 55) should be reserved for quoining: the style referred to here is 'upright and flat' which is a different technique from 'long and short', though they are often confused. The select bibliography is useful though one book should certainly have been omitted. Mr. Blair himself points out (p. 359 n. 1) one of the many gross errors in which that particular work abounds. The account of translations of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* on p. 368 needs correction. The translation in the Loeb Classical Library is by T. Stapleton (1565) with some corrections made by J. E. King. The translation published in Everyman's Library is that of J. Stevens (1723), revised by J. A. Giles (1847) with notes by L. C. Jane (1903). It is the introduction only which is by Vida Scudder.

All these of course are details. The important fact is that we have here a comprehensive book on the Anglo-Saxon background which can safely be put into the hands of that fast-growing number of students who are anxious to learn something about the pre-Conquest period.

BERTRAM COLGRAVE

The Ancrene Riwle. Rendered into Modern English and edited by M. B. SALU. With a Preface by J. R. R. TOLKIEN and an Introduction and Appendix by DOM GERARD SITWELL. Pp. xxviii + 196 (Orchard Books). London: Burns and Oates, 1955. 15*s.* net.

Since this translation reverses the usual order, in which translation follows a critical edition, or at least a printing of the text, its full value will be clear only when we have the E.E.T.S. edition.[1] In the meantime it is a valuable and readable introduction to the *Ancrene Riwle*. Miss Salu gives a remarkably skilful translation, in the face of countless difficulties of syntax, vocabulary, and thought. Although some post-war Orchard Books allow less space to notes than earlier volumes did, a number of difficulties are mentioned (e.g. pp. 37, 44, 95, 96), and occasionally there is a brief but useful discussion (e.g. 36, 90, 149). To the note on p. 139 it should be added that the stipulation 'all to one man' was usual in instructions on confession.[2] The tale of sin must not be hypocritically

[1] I am grateful to the Librarian of Lady Margaret Hall for access to photostats of MS. C.C.C.C. 402. For this review I have examined chiefly passages corresponding to MS. Cotton Nero A XIV (E.E.T.S., O.S. 225), pp. 28/6–35/14, 51/21–56/8, and 174/31–183/22. To save space in quotation, I sometimes refer to Nero (N) if the Corpus reading agrees apart from spelling.

[2] e.g. Gratian, *De Poen.*, Di v, c. 1 (*Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. A. Friedberg (Leipzig, 1879), i. 1239–40); *Ayenbite of Inwyt* (E.E.T.S., O S. 23), p. 175.

divided, separate parts to different priests, because 'God haþ not to done of suche iapes'.[1]

At one or two difficult points the translation goes astray. On pp. 56–57, 'in order to exchange them for men who fight well, as one does with money' should be 'so that with them he may pay, as one does with money, men who fight well',[2] At the end of this quotation 'through whom he disciplines his soldiers' should be 'which he distributes to his soldiers'.[3] Again, on p. 171, 'but the wicked use earth and sea and sun for their own ends' (for *ȝet te uuele seruiȝ . eorðe sea . and sunne*) should be 'the earth, sea and sun serve even the wicked' (alluding to Matt. v. 45).[4] On p. 30, the phrase *as in hire stude* is not translated.[5] On p. 178, 'as if to ask a kiss' should be 'as if to give (offer) a kiss'.[6] On p. 186 (n. 3), the straightforward sense of the Corpus and Cleopatra readings is 'It is against you, who see men, that the Apostle speaks', although the context, and other discussions,[7] might lead one to expect 'allow yourself to be seen by men'. The different contexts of *inwardliche*[8] occasionally give trouble. On p. 55 the sense is not 'within himself', for the words converted the man who had injured the speaker.[9] On p. 174, in *to schawin hire openliche hu inwardliche he luuede hire*, the closeness of *openliche* suggests some slight word play, which could be met by a word such as 'deeply'.[10]

At other points there is room rather for difference of interpretation. On p. 28 the syntax of *& prefter Benedicite . þet he ah to seggen* suggests a slightly different emphasis: 'after that (should follow) *Benedicite*, which it is for him to say', rather than 'and he should then reply with *Benedicite*'.[11] On p. 31 'great difference' would be better than 'clear distinction'.[12] On p. 54 the translation of *longe friniht* by 'long night before the Friday' (supported by the French version)

[1] *Vices and Virtues*, MS. B.M. Add. 17013, f. 54[r] b.

[2] f. 34[v], cf. N. 55/29–31.

[3] 'disciplines' for *donat* (f. 34[v], cf. MS. Cotton Vitellius F VII (E.E.T.S., O.S. 219), p. 104/20), may be an interpretation of the context, but Miss Salu has probably substituted silently *domat* (N. 55/32, cf. Latin text (E.E.T.S., O.S. 216), p. 39/21). Corpus agrees with *donet* in the Common Gloss: 'sed et persecutores habet quasi in vtre, quia nil nisi permissi faciunt, et ponit eos sibi in thesauris, vt ex eis donet milites flagellantes filios' (*Biblia cum Glosis Ordinariis* (Venice, 1495), ii. f. 449[r] b), and with Peter Lombard (*P.L.* 191, col. 330). For the thought behind this exegesis compare Augustine (*P.L.* 36, col. 290) and Bede (ibid. 93, col. 648). For *milites* = *filios* (not *crudeles* or *persecutores*) cf. P. Lombard.

[4] f. 105, N. 176/28–29. Cf. 'Inde magis significat quid servet bonis, cum ostendit quanta donet et malis' (Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* XXXII, *P.L.* 36, col. 280).

[5] f. 17, N. 30/12.

[6] *as to beoden cos* f. 108[v], N. 183/16. Cf. N. 50/8, 69/32, 102/2, 189/35, and a passage in Pseudo-Anselm, *Meditatio* x 'caput inclino, os porrigo, osculare quantumlibet' (*P.L.* 158, col. 761). But compare also N. 129/5.

[7] Honorius of Autun, *De mulieribus*, *De velo mulierum* (*P.L.* 172, cols. 589, 764).

[8] e.g. N. 23/8, 97/17, 127/16.

[9] f. 33[v], N. 54/15; cf. *Verba Seniorum*, XVI (*P.L.* 73, col. 973).

[10] f. 106–106[v], N. 179/14.

[11] f. 15[v], N. 28/11–12. With this formula before conversation, and the person to use it, compare *The Observances in use at the Augustinian Priory of Barnwell*, ed. J. W. Clark (Cambridge, 1897), pp. 138, 222.

[12] *ah muchel to beon bitweonen*, f. 17[v], N. 30/17.

instead of 'night before Good Friday' should surely have a footnote.[1] On p. 55 to 'talk *to them* in this way' (italics mine) would probably only provoke further discord, and does not seem implied by *swa ȝe schulden seggen*.[2] On p. 170 'for the good of others, for His sake' should probably be 'for the good and benefit of another'.[3] On p. 172 'that they had power to raise the dead' would be better than 'that they might have raised the dead'.[4]

In the introduction Dom Gerard Sitwell uses recent work on the penitential legislation and literature of the thirteenth century (pp. xix–xxi), and this discussion, together with C. Kirchberger's comments on the same topic,[5] contributes to the long-lasting discussion of the date of composition. It would be incautious, however, to swing too firmly to a case for secular authorship (p. xxi), for it is very difficult to fit the well-known reference to '*our* lay-brothers'[6] to such a view. The Regular and Sempringham Canons, as well as the Friars, had opportunity for study and for pastoral experience, while a man's training and experience before entering a monastery or order cannot be discounted.

Miss Salu and Dom Sitwell have taken the identification of patristic quotations a long step forward, particularly those from Gregory and Bernard. A few more from Augustine and Anselm may be added here:

Anselm: pp. 64, 143: *Meditatio*, ii (*P.L.* 158, col. 723); p. 135: ibid., col. 724; p. 149: ibid., col. 722.

Augustine: p. 45: *Confessiones*, x. 32 (*P.L.* 32, col. 799); p. 171: *Conf.* x. 29 (ibid., col. 796); p. 147 (2nd quot. = N. 150/12–13): *Conf.* ix. 13 (ibid., col. 778).

p. 145: *In Ioannis Evangelium*, xlix (*P.L.* 35, col. 1756).

p. 38: *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ix (*P.L.* 36, col. 126); p. 127: *En. in Ps.* xxxvi (ibid., col. 366).

p. 149: *Sermo* clxxxi (*P.L.* 38, col. 981).

p. 103: *De Trinitate*, iv. c. i (*P.L.* 42, cols. 885, 887).

p. 25: *Epistola* 211 (*P.L.* 33, col. 961); p. 26: ibid. Both were probably commonplace (cf., for example, Gratian, c. xxxii, q. v, c. 12, ed. Friedberg, i. 1135), but the second is quoted with the reading *criminosum est*, which belongs to the Rule of St. Augustine. (For the text see J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons* (London, 1950), pp. 273 ff., and *Revue Bénédictine*, xlii (1930), 322).

JOY RUSSELL-SMITH

English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages. By HARDIN CRAIG. Pp. viii + 422. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. 42*s.* net.

Probably the most important, and certainly the most refreshing aspect of this book is the way in which Professor Craig has kept his promise to deal with the

[1] f. 33, N. 53/21.
[2] f. 34, N. 54/23–24.
[3] f. 104, N. 175/26. Cf. N. 30/26, 39/8, 47/5, 182/18, &c.
[4] *þet ha mahten deade arearen*, f. 105ᵛ, N. 177/21–22.
[5] *Dominican Studies*, vii (1954), 230–5.
[6] *ure breðren* f. 111; *ure leatwude breþren* N. 188/2–3 and 10/25.

medieval drama 'not primarily as if its importance lay in its significance for the development of Elizabethan drama, but as something important and significant in itself and significant for the understanding of the medieval world'. His approach is a sympathetic one, quite free from any trace of the patronizing attitude so common among students of the later drama and not altogether unknown among medievalists themselves. Welcome also is his uncompromising recognition of the basic religious motive behind this body of literature, and the inescapable but frequently forgotten corollary that the plays 'cannot be viewed as free enterprises in secular and individualistic dramatic art'. The book reflects an enviable familiarity with the volumes of scholarship now surrounding the subject, and with the extant dramatic texts. The later portions of the book, in which Mr. Craig examines these texts individually and in some detail, are undoubtedly the most valuable, his critical comments, even when arousing disagreement, filling a gap in the subject which few people have even attempted to fill since the foundations were laid by Karl Young and E. K. Chambers. In this connexion Mr. Craig has kept his second promise, not to supersede Young and Chambers, but to supplement them in fields which they did not cover.

At the same time, and not surprisingly in a work of this scope, one has misgivings about certain of the points made. Statements such as 'I could not fail to take the French religious drama into consideration, since the English religious drama originated mainly in France, and was from time to time influenced by the French' (p. v), and (on the subject of miracle plays) 'As usual one has to turn to the continent to get an idea of what once existed in England' (p. 81) surely ought not to be made without a considerable number of provisos. The question of French influence on all kinds of English medieval literature is, of course, a hardy annual, but an extremely prickly one, and the native elements in the English drama are sufficiently strong to make any such sweeping conclusions as these extremely rash. But Mr. Craig *does* make provisos in other parts of his book; not enough of them, in my opinion, but at least enough to make it surprising that he should have written these two sentences. In fact his treatment of this topic reveals a number of inconsistencies, reflecting perhaps some uncertainty in his own mind. On p. 138, for example, it is difficult to know what conclusion to draw from the following:

> It is now pretty generally agreed that the English religious plays grew from liturgical origins on English soil and were not, in general, translated from the French. This refers only to the Corpus Christi plays and the plays of their time, since of course there can be no doubt that England at one time or another borrowed the whole religious drama from France and other parts of the continent. It may be that, in some instances, the English had only patterns of continental dramas on which to work, but the probabilities are that in the earliest times they usually resorted to translation.

The evidence for the 'earliest times' in England is in any case scanty indeed, and at this point Mr. Craig seems only to confuse the issue. Nor can much significance be attached to the fact that 'there is almost no religious play preserved or recorded in England that is not also to be found in France or in French records' (p. 139); this neither proves nor supports any theory whatever. Later, in a

discussion of the Chester plays, where the problem of French influence is particularly acute, Mr. Craig shows how the evidence, beginning with the sixteenth-century tradition that Higden 'redused ye whole history of ye bible into Englishe stories in metter in ye Englishe tounge' (whatever that means) for a French original for the Chester plays has been 'gradually and tentatively accumulated'. These adverbs, the second in particular, need to be stressed. From p. 171 to p. 176 Mr. Craig rightly submits the evidence to a pretty close examination, rejecting some of it as insignificant, and expressing scepticism on a number of better-established points. It is with something of a shock, therefore, that one reads (p. 176): 'On the basis, then, not of parallel passages and general probabilities, but of agreement in unique matters of structure and contents, we may be sure that the Chester plays were translated and adapted from the French.' The evidence, interesting as some of it is, does not warrant such a whole-hearted acceptance of the theory, particularly when we find that it involves the acceptance of a non-existent earlier and simpler version of *Le Mistère du Viel Testament*; these non-existent analogues, with their unfortunate tendency to assume concrete form the more they are talked about, are an unmitigated nuisance in literary history, and it is perhaps an instinctive recoil from this one that reduces Mr. Craig's 'certainty' to the 'highest degree of probability' on p. 177. And only ten pages later is another indication of what I take to be his uncertainty on this matter, for in discussing the various scenes in the Chester cycle he comes to 'the extraordinary scene of Octavian and the Sibyl, whose likeness to *Octovien* in *Le Mistère du Viel Testament* has already been noted', and remarks: 'The whole construction is very puzzling. Actual Nativity plays are not liturgical, and yet in this case the Chester play presents a Nativity play as a central episode in a legend. It is the more perplexing because *Octovien* in *Le Mistère* has none of the features of a Nativity play.' One might suggest that something rather more than translation is at stake here! Mr. Craig is on safer ground when he remembers from time to time, and properly emphasizes, that the material for these plays was everywhere in the Middle Ages, common stock in every country, and that the hunting of sources is even more dangerous here than it is in other periods.

One could wish that Mr. Craig had not felt it necessary to devote quite so much space to the Latin liturgical drama, the exact relationship of which to the extant English medieval drama is far from clear and certainly not so simple as many people would like to believe. Again there is this dangerous tendency to 'turn to the continent to get an idea of what once existed in England' (a method by no means without value, but needing to be used with very great care), and the scholarly habit of nature-like abhorring a vacuum and attempting to fill it at all costs. The notion that 'the Latin drama of the church became a secular drama in the hands of the laity' (p. 48) raises far more questions than it answers, yet although Mr. Craig seems to realize its dangers from time to time, it forms a basic assumption throughout his work. We need always to bear in mind just how far the Latin liturgical drama went in complexity, and then realize that there is still a considerable gap between its high-water mark and the extant vernacular guild cycles. Karl Young hinted at some of the great differ-

ences at the end of his second volume, pointing to the inclusion in the vernacular plays of a great number of themes and other material not to be paralleled in the extant Church texts, to the transformation from a cosmopolitan product into a variety of national developments resulting in 'significant variations in literary form, in choice of themes, and in methods of performance'. By devoting almost a third of his book to liturgical material Mr. Craig has tended to gloss over these very important distinctions, and the unwary reader will certainly be left with the impression that the development of a quite sophisticated literary form was really much simpler than a full assessment of the evidence shows it to have been. One might quarrel too with his assertion that 'the religious drama had no dramatic technique or dramatic purpose, and no artistic self-consciousness' (p. 4); while one would readily agree that 'its life-blood was religion', there need be no necessary incompatibility between the two attitudes, and at the lowest level one would suppose that the very choice of a dramatic form indicated at least the glimmerings of artistry.

Two small points should be noted. The Sykes MS. of the York Scriveners' pageant has been more recently published by A. C. Cawley in *Leeds Studies in English*, vii–viii (1952), 45–80 (Craig p. 200, n. 1). It seems a little odd to speak of the Passion play 'prevailing' in London (pp. 152–3) when the three examples quoted, the 'History of the Old Testament' in 1378 by the minor clergy of St. Paul's, a five-day-long mystery play in 1384, and a play in 1409 of 'How God created Heaven and Earth out of Nothing, and how he created Adam and so on to the Day of Judgement' were clearly anything but Passion plays. The conjectures in the remainder of this paragraph can hardly be made with reasonable assurance.

ARTHUR BROWN

The Elizabethan Love Sonnet. By J. W. LEVER. Pp. x+282. London: Methuen, 1956. 25*s.* net.

Professor Lever does not share the view that the Elizabethan sonnet would have been just the same had Wyatt and Surrey never written. After a brief glance at the Petrarchan sonnet, he therefore begins with Wyatt. Throughout his book Mr. Lever uses to good effect the method of comparing in detail two or three sonnets of his English author with the originals on which they were based. It emerges at once that Wyatt's most striking innovation, adopted by nearly all his Elizabethan successors, was the use of the final couplet. The rest of his energy was absorbed in the attempt to prevent Old English stress patterns from intruding in his decasyllabic line. Mr. Lever is inclined to overestimate Wyatt's success ('Please it you so to this to doo relieff' is scarcely a 'flexible' line). Confidence in the able demonstration that Wyatt 'had indeed travelled far since his first crude efforts at translation some twenty years before' (p. 33) is undermined by an afterthought prefixed to this section, presumably to cover the fact that most of the sonnets are undated:

> (It need not, of course, be assumed that the order of development in which these examples will be ranged is the same as their order of composition. Like other poets, Wyatt probably found his way to maturity by a winding route.) (p. 20)

Mr. Lever's analyses of Wyatt's sonnets and their models bring out also Wyatt's basically anti-Petrarchan attitude, and the colloquialism which Sidney used later so brilliantly.

The iambic line was established for Surrey, and Mr. Lever finds his principal contribution to sonnet form in his experiments in rhyme schemes and in his development of a logical structure on a 'When . . . then' pattern with the weight thrown forward on to the couplet (cf. Shakespeare).

With *Astrophel and Stella* England had her first real sonnet sequence to match those of Italy and France. Mr. Lever has some sensible things to say about the interaction of autobiography and literary convention; and he is good on Sidney's way of playing off the rhyme scheme (quatrain plus couplet) against his sentence structure (sestet). He is better still on the surprise tactics Sidney uses to infuse new life into his cupid imagery. Whilst noting the flexibility of Sidney's metre and his fondness for word play, Mr. Lever considers that the use of personification and the habit of conferring personality on inanimate things are his outstanding features.

Even if Sidney had read *The Faerie Queene*, it is doubtful whether Mr. Lever is justified in assuming that it is the target of Sonnet 28 (p. 75). That Spenser's *Amoretti* was one of the sonnet sequences published as a result of the vogue created by *Astrophel and Stella* is less disputable. According to Mr. Lever Sidney kept to the true purpose of the sonnet sequence: the telling of a story of a courtship in the romance tradition and the revelation of personality. In both these aims he finds that the *Amoretti* fails. He gives good reasons why the story is confused—the signs of hasty publication, the insertion of sonnets belonging to a conventional romance courtship in a later sequence leading to marriage, the addition of 'epigrams' to fill up the space before *Epithalamion*, the incongruousness of the last four sonnets where the happiness of the lovers is interrupted by wicked slander. Here Mr. Lever suspects some personal event in Spenser's life is to blame, and compares the last four stanzas of Book VI of *The Faerie Queene* where, after being vanquished, the Blatant Beast has escaped, and also *Colin Clout*, ll. 688 ff. The suggestion that Amoret, who represents virtuous love in *The Faerie Queene*, Book III, and is the central figure of Book VI, is the actual heroine of the *Amoretti* is attractive. And the parallels from Spenser's *Hymn to Love* help to emphasize how different his conception of love was from that of the Petrarchan sonneteer. Mr. Lever further illuminates Spenser's Neoplatonism by reference to Bembo's high claims for the love of the 'not yong' courtier in Castiglione's *The Courtier*. Mr. Lever speaks of the 'seamless texture' of Spenser's sonnets; it is this as much as their abstractness which makes them less arresting poems than Sidney's or Shakespeare's. Is it not that by his interlacing rhyme scheme Spenser presents us with two couplets before we reach the final one, which thus loses its culminative force?

In a chapter on the late Elizabethan sonnet Mr. Lever indicates the merits of Daniel and Drayton; but his final verdict is that they failed to evoke a new and arresting central theme. Shakespeare achieved this by substituting a young noble patron for the traditional mistress (Spenser's solution is dismissed as being

against the English sonnet tradition, p. 276). Of course Mr. Lever is aware that the greatness of Shakespeare's sonnets is not confined to this one change. In the course of his chapters on Shakespeare's sonnets he says many perspicacious things; but he does not bring out quite as clearly as one would like the firmness of the argument and the use of imagery or examples to reinforce the structure of three quatrains and a couplet (e.g. 64). He emphasizes their dramatic quality and plausibly suggests (pp. 180, 209 f.) that certain sonnets are linked with the plays of the middle period: his comparison of Bassanio's soliloquy (*M.V.*, III. ii) with Sonnet 67 is revealing.

These chapters are the most controversial in Mr. Lever's book, for he joins the ranks of those who would rearrange the order of the sonnets. He dismisses previous attempts rather cursorily. There is no reference to Tucker Brooke's fairly modest readjustments; and Sir Denys Bray's rearrangement on the basis of rhyme links (which also does much to give the story coherence) has won too wide a currency to be dismissed in a footnote in any study proposing a new solution. Mr. Lever offers us the sonnets grouped by themes. Whilst he does not accept Professor Baldwin's 'perfect continuity' based on a 'vegetable growth' of imagery, he claims that attention to the imagery has prevented him from going wrong in his arrangement of the sonnets on each theme. Mr. Lever gives himself an advantage over his predecessors by not feeling obliged to fit all the sonnets in (Sonnet 71, so far as I can find, is conveniently forgotten—indeed the sonnets on the poet's own death appear to be unplaced). This leads one, perhaps unjustly, to suspect that his arrangement is partly a matter of convenience for his own exposition—particularly when he says: 'It will prove convenient to give attention first to the Mistress sonnets' (p. 173). But it is difficult to judge fairly of an arrangement without having the whole sequence printed in the proposed order; nor does Mr. Lever ask us to regard his new order as definitive or complete. Most readers must find the last two sonnets in Thorpe a hopelessly inadequate ending, even if they do not agree with Mr. Lever that 'remorse and atonement' is the only possible end. In order to achieve this end he groups the sonnets to a Friend as follows: (i) *The Invitation to Marry*; (ii) *The Poet in Absence*; (iii) *The Friend's Fault*; (iv) *The Poet and his Rivals*; (v) *The Poet's Error*; (vi) *The Immortalization*. (i) is the only section which is found as a group in Thorpe's 1609 edition. The total effect of Mr. Lever's grouping might be to replace variety by monotony. For example, he wishes to place together the sonnets on the Friend's picture (24, 46–47) which, as can be seen in Bray, gives the intolerable result of two neighbouring sonnets beginning 'Mine eye . . . ' and with the final couplet rhyme on 'heart'. In spite of the anachronisms to which Mr. Lever draws attention on p. 209, I am not absolutely convinced that the sonnets on the Friend's fault could not have been designedly spread through the collection from 33 to 96. Love is notoriously inconsistent, and it is perfectly possible to admit a friend's fault one day and to speak of his 'pure unstained prime' several months later. Although Sonnets 18 and 19 form a perfect introduction to *The Immortalization*, and Sonnet 19 begins with Ovid's *tempus edax rerum* from *Metamorphoses* XV, which Mr. Lever shows to be behind many of the sonnets on this theme, Mr. Lever nearly convinces me that these sonnets

should form the final group—55 (with its echo of the end of *Met.* XV) being the final sonnet.

It should be clear by now that any future editor of the Sonnets will have to consider Mr. Lever's findings. He will also be grateful for the suggested emendation *priud* for *proud* in 67: *yare* for *y'are* (112) is less convincing (*are* gives better sense and sound). Illuminating, too, is Mr. Lever's discovery that the first group of sonnets, *The Invitation to Marry*, is certainly indebted to 'An Epistle to perswade a yong Gentleman to mariage, deuised by Erasmus, in behalfe of a freend' included in Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique*. But by calling this letter 'the epistle *De Conscribendis*' and implying that it expressed Erasmus's own views, Mr. Lever obscures the fact that it may have been simply a literary exercise, being one of the examples in Erasmus's popular handbook on the art of letter writing, *Libellus de Conscribendis Epistolis*. J. R.

Cymbeline. Edited by J. M. NOSWORTHY. Pp. lxxxiv+224 (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General Editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR). London: Methuen, 1955. 18*s.* net.

The New Arden edition proceeds on its stately way, and Mr. Nosworthy's *Cymbeline* is a sedate member of the procession. His Introduction contains much valuable material. He dates the play in 1608 or 1609, maybe 'more or less simultaneous with the composition of *The Winter's Tale*'. He does not accept Thorndike's argument that Shakespeare was imitating *Philaster*, and while admitting the attractions of G. E. Bentley's theory that 'the impending acquisition of the Blackfriars private theatre' led to the decision that Shakespeare should write for this and not for the Globe, he points out that 'it was at the Globe that Forman saw *The Winter's Tale*, and, presumably, *Cymbeline*'.

Mr. Nosworthy is particularly helpful and clear about the sources, showing the debt to Holinshed ('relatively slight'), probably supported by reading the two 'tragedies' of Guiderius in the additions to *The Mirror for Magistrates*, and the brief reference in Spenser (*F.Q.* II. x) where Arviragus is Cymbeline's brother. Discrepancies and obscurities in these probably set Shakespeare's fancy free, so that 'the pseudo-history in the play has no real source' other than a general dependence on Holinshed; and the reading behind *Macbeth* produced the battle in v. iii. Various versions of the Wager story are reviewed and rejected, until in the end we are left with 'Boccaccio's *Decameron*, the prose tale of *Frederyke of Jennen*, and that inevitable and embarrassing shadow, a lost version in prose, verse, or play form'. Boccaccio Shakespeare could have read in a French version (but it always seems to me that if he could read French he would find little difficulty with medieval Italian). A detailed case is made for Shakespeare's use of *Frederyke*. For the story of Belarius and the princes he drew on that 'ramshackle old play' *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*. This connexion is important for the editor since Shakespeare 'was no longer concerned with historical drama or with comedy of intrigue, but with the golden inconsequence of romance, which is a thing *per se*'. Professor Wilson Knight

has treated the play as being in the main about 'national issues', Britain *versus* Rome, and the Briton Posthumus against the cunning foreigner, the Renaissance Italian Iachimo. Mr. Nosworthy, without rejecting this altogether, insists more on 'the adventures of princes and princesses', the 'righting of old wrongs'. 'Shakespeare introduces the wager plot and the historical matter into this pattern, not because they were essential to it, but because he judged them to be tractable and concordant agents of elaboration.'

Shakespeare was certainly not losing interest in drama. For Mr. Nosworthy *Cymbeline* is an 'experimental romance' in which Shakespeare made mistakes 'in undertaking something hitherto unattempted'. (But had not Shakespeare attempted romance before? Maybe the novelty consisted in combining elements which had already been successfully used separately.) The major mistake lay in enlarging upon 'Roman military and political affairs in a manner better suited to *Julius Caesar* or *Coriolanus* than to romantic drama. Briefly, romance can carry a Cymbeline but not a Caesar; it can encompass a half-civilised Britain but not the ordered state of Rome.' Now this reveals an attitude to romance alien to that of the Elizabethans, who saw no great gulf between the actual world, or the world of past history or realistic comedy, and the world of pastoral and romance. The one could merge into the other: Bottom might be bewitched by Puck; Oberon could watch the story of Greene's *James the Fourth*; and for the original audience of *Cymbeline* the Roman theme would not overburden the romantic tale.

There is more justice in the contention that the characters are disproportionate. Mr. Nosworthy points to the marked differences in depth of characterization; but his conception of romance is narrow when he regrets that Posthumus is not throughout 'a *chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*' and treats Imogen as 'a superb accident, a Perdita or Miranda who defeated Shakespeare's intentions by coming to life'. This casts doubt on his conception of the play, admirable though much of his interpretation is. Maybe the two later ladies are less 'impaired by excessive vitality' because their functions were different, and the emotional vicissitudes of Imogen, isolated by her husband's banishment and later jealousy, surrounded by malice and folly, betrayed by Iachimo's adventurous callousness (which the editor describes well), and escaping (like a less happy Rosalind) to the comparative innocence of the primitive west, are more central to the play than the editor makes apparent. Perhaps there was something in the Victorian Imogen-cult after all. *Cymbeline* may indeed be regarded as a successful experiment in contrast and modulation, of a kind not unknown in Shakespeare's earlier work. But here he modulates from *novella* to pastoral romance, from 'history' to mythology, from tragic to idyllic, and there is no real cleavage between the elements in this 'curious imbroglio of Augustus's Rome, and Cymbeline's Britain, of the dawn of the Christian era and the Renaissance'. In his useful comments on style and imagery Mr. Nosworthy is aware of a movement from tragic to tragicomic, comic, and lyrical manners, but he does not make enough of this. I cannot follow him in his conclusion that 'there is, simply, something in this play which goes "beyond beyond" '.

The editing is on the whole marked by cool common sense and the text is

handled judiciously. In I. i. 3 for F 'Kings' he puts 'king's', making better sense than Tyrwhitt's 'king', but he does not give the detailed paraphrase needed to make the meaning clear. At l. 24, Ff 1, 2, 'far', instead of Ff 3, 4, 'fair' deserves a note if only to discuss a possible play on sound and to link 'far' with ll. 25–27, where the images of extending, crushing, and unfolding seem to refer back to l. 23 'stuff' and to an operation such as ironing a dress rather than to the rack. The note on l. 50 does not clarify the sense. At I. vii. 48–49 'that tub' is rather a characteristic Renaissance emblem of greed than a reference to the Danaides. At l. 109, if F 'illustrious' may have been Shakespeare's own word, why read 'illustrous' instead? Some notes are wordy, and the editor is needlessly diffident in proposing his own solutions. Resolved to be fair and all-inclusive, he cites some wild or stupid emendations or interpretations, only to dismiss them. But why give them in this edition? By omitting other men's follies he could make room for more of his own sagacity. II. iii. 92 'deep' might have its meaning 'solemn', 'affecting', appended to what is given. At l. 107 'verbal' may refer to the word-play and nice distinctions just indulged in. At IV. ii. 109–12 the editor sits on the fence too long, and leaves us unsatisfied, though Theobald's 'th'effect' for F 'defect' seems the only intelligent reading cited. At V. i. 14 'each elder worse' might mean 'each misdeed worse than its predecessors the older their "doers" become'. There are many such minor points in any play where a reviewer may differ from an editor. Usually Mr. Nosworthy's balancing of possibilities is valuable since it makes the reader see the difficulties and decide for himself. This is indeed a thoughtful edition. There are useful Appendixes, giving sources and notes on stage history and the songs, including an early seventeenth-century setting of 'Harke, harke the Larke'. G. BULLOUGH

The Sermons of John Donne. Edited with Introductions and Critical Apparatus by GEORGE R. POTTER and EVELYN M. SIMPSON. Vol. VII, pp. vi+464; Vol. II, pp. x+466. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1954, 1955. $7.50; 56*s.* 6*d.* net each volume.

The intention to issue two volumes of this great edition each year has been temporarily interrupted by the death, in April 1954, of George Potter, who is briefly but fittingly commemorated by his fellow-editor at the beginning of Volume II, the last he was able to prepare for the press. I am sure that all readers of this journal will join with me in offering their sympathies and good wishes to Mrs. Simpson, who must now complete this heavy task alone.

The general plan and scope of the edition I have sufficiently described, and in some respects ventured to criticize, in my review of Volumes I and VI.[1] Of the present instalment, Vol. II contains eighteen sermons preached between the spring and summer of 1618 and March 1619/20, many of them at Lincoln's Inn, where Donne was Divinity Reader from October 1616 until his resignation

[1] *R.E.S.*, N.S. VI (1955), 417–27.

to accept the Deanery of St. Paul's in February 1621/2; Vol. VII contains eighteen sermons preached, mainly at St. Paul's and Whitehall, between January 1625/6 and May 1627. I propose first to notice briefly certain matters in the generally excellent editorial Introductions; then to offer a few reflections suggested by a reading of the sermons; and to conclude (as before) with a list of passages where further correction or emendation would seem to be required.

In their Preface to Vol. II the editors declare:

> We decided to make our notes to this edition textual, not explanatory, since our main concern is to try to establish text and chronology. General comments on the individual sermons are included in the Introductions to the separate volumes of our edition; but specific explanations of Donne's innumerable references to authorities and of[1] the many passages in the sermons that deserve explanatory or critical consideration we leave to future scholars. (p. v)

On this my first comment is a wish that the publishers would attempt to find without delay some scholar able to undertake this indispensable task, so that a supplementary volume of commentary may be issued soon after the edition is complete. My second comment is that the textual problem (as I attempted to show at some length in my previous review) is really far simpler than the editors seem to suggest, and that I cannot help thinking that that admirable and devoted scholar George Potter, under the influence of the 'New Bibliography', had acquired an almost superstitious reverence for manuscripts as such, without regard to their real importance, and devoted a quite disproportionate amount of his time and energy to collating them and recording their variants. With Sermon No. 6 in Vol. II, the only one of Donne's extant sermons that has survived only in manuscript, it was perhaps desirable to list all the variants; nevertheless, anything like constant reference from the sixteen pages of variants printed at the end of the volume to the lines of the text is so laborious that it will probably be very seldom attempted. Still more superfluous, one may be inclined to think, are the many pages of variants from the Quarto (*Six Sermons*, 1634) and from various manuscripts for Sermons 8, 15, and 16 in the same volume, of which the editors have based their texts on those of *Fifty Sermons*.

In the Introduction to Vol. II there is much interesting information about Donne and Lincoln's Inn, although I am far from convinced by the attempt (pp. 8 ff.) to demonstrate that the sermons he preached there were peculiarly adapted to his audience. It would, I think, be possible to find just as many allusions to past sinfulness and just as many legal metaphors in other sermons, and it is worth remarking that in the first of these Lincoln's Inn sermons (as occasionally elsewhere) there is often a humbleness of style (see especially p. 61) such as might, *a priori*, seem more appropriate to St. Dunstan's. Neither can I detect any important difference in kind between No. 7 in this volume, preached at Whitehall, and the six Lincoln's Inn sermons that precede it. In fact, the attempt to establish any close relation between particular sermons and the congregations to which they were preached seems to me unprofitable, superficial, and misleading. At all times Donne was a Christian preaching to Christians

[1] Inadvertently printed as 'to'.

and an Anglican preaching to Anglicans, and my impression is that on any occasion he might be moved either to personal confession or stinging rebuke. I am puzzled by the remark (p. 21) that the style of No. 7, printed from the *XXVI Sermons* of 1661, 'is at times so ambiguous in its grammatical structure that the editors of the present edition have wondered whether some of the flaws in style may come from careless copying', for I have not myself found in it any notable examples of obscurity. In quoting (p. 22) from the same sermon, and in describing as unusual, a passage praising the eloquence and literary style of the Scriptures, the editor has not noticed that there is a very similar passage in a later sermon (Vol. VI, p. 56), which I quoted in my previous review as an interesting parallel with a famous passage in *Paradise Regained*. It might also have been noticed that, besides these more formal and elaborate, Donne has many brief and incidental tributes to the literary quality of the Bible, describing and, as it were, exhibiting some scriptural phrase in such terms as 'that elegancy of the Holy Ghost' (Vol. II, p. 119, l. 8; p. 128, l. 348; p. 130, l. 398; p. 136, l. 197; p. 353, ll. 199–200).

In the Introduction to Vol. VII there is much that I should like to praise, and if space compels me to confine my remarks to one or two matters where I think that opinions might be revised, I hope this may not be taken to imply any want of admiration for the learning and judgement that have made this and the other Introductions the indispensable companions they will long remain. On p. 36 there is a brief but very valuable discussion, with references to previous writings by Mrs. Simpson, on the significance of Donne's remark, 'I date my life from my Ministery'. There can, I think, be no doubt that the term 'conversion' cannot be appropriately applied to any of the stages in Donne's religious development: nevertheless, it would seem that Gosse's erroneous and too readily accepted postdating of the *La Corona* sonnets, of the prayers in the *Essays in Divinity*, and of most of the Holy Sonnets was largely influenced by the significance he attributed to Walton's statement (not here alluded to) that it was after the death of his wife that Donne became finally 'crucified to the world'—in other words, that Gosse's postdating of the sonnets and prayers was not the cause but the effect of his interpretation of Walton's statement, which it is therefore important, in all discussions of this subject, to take into account. For my part, I should be inclined to say that the death of Donne's wife was an important stage in a long process of what I have ventured to call 'deepening'. To the very convincing arguments (pp. 28–32) in favour of 1627 as the year for the undated Sermon No. 13, 'Preached upon Candlemas Day', may be added a piece of internal evidence which the editors seem to have overlooked: the fact that his text comes from the Sermon on the Mount gives Donne the opportunity to begin with a brief discourse on sermons in general, in the course of which he insists that not every part of a sermon concerns every hearer of it, and that, for example, it is sometimes necessary to preach against usury and extortion, although by no means all the congregation may be guilty of it (pp. 327–8). It seems almost certain that Donne is here replying to objections which had been excited by the long rebuke, one of the most vehement in all his sermons, which only a week before, in Sermon No. 12, he had delivered to the merchants who profaned

St. Paul's: 'You meet below, and there make your bargaines, for biting, for devouring Usury, and then you come up hither to prayers, and so make God your Broker' (p. 317). In the remarks (p. 48) on No. 18, it is not noticed that Donne apparently delivered it as the first part of a kind of double sermon, and that he intended to deal with the second part of his division of the text on another day (see p. 435, ll. 39 ff.). Occasionally a sermon seems to be too readily dismissed as 'tedious'. No. 6 is indeed very controversial, but, at the same time, a very interesting example of the manner in which Donne conceived and executed the duty of 'brasing and beating' his pulpit-drum against the Papists. Harder to understand is the uncompromising dismissal of No. 18 with the words 'If all Donne's sermons had been as dull as this one, there would have been no need for this edition' (p. 48); for this Whitsunday sermon on the comfort of the Holy Ghost, though not one of Donne's very best, is certainly one of his most interesting. It is a consistent and moving exhortation both to assurance and to humility, and is in great and striking contrast with the abstract way in which he has handled the doctrine of the Trinity in some of his earlier sermons.

Of sermons excellent as a whole—possessing, that is to say, not merely memorable 'passages' but a continuous onward movement such as Donne does not always achieve—I would mention, in Vol. II, No. 3, at Lincoln's Inn, which is almost a series of variations on two themes, the personality and the multiplicity of sin; No. 8, before the Countess of Montgomery, on the text 'Whosoever shall fall on this stone . . .', in which Donne considers all the various senses in which Christ may be regarded as a stone, and of which the editor, describing it as 'a superb example of the type of sermon often called "metaphysical" ', reveals a just appreciation (pp. 25–26); No. 9, to the Lords, which contains the celebrated passage about the death of ecstasy; No. 14, the second of the two sermons into which Donne later expanded and divided the sermon he had preached at The Hague in December 1619, and of which I think more highly than the editor does (p. 39): despite some perhaps over-ingenious similes, it is one of the best constructed of Donne's sermons and contains an exceptionally full statement of his theological position. In Vol. VII I would mention No. 1, at St. Paul's; No. 10, at the funerals of Sir William Cokayne, one of the most perfectly constructed and most consistently moving and eloquent of all Donne's sermons, on one of his favourite themes, the imperfection of all human and terrestrial things; and No. 14, to the King at Whitehall, even though it is perhaps less concentrated than some of Donne's very best sermons and although its amplification is sometimes nearer to formal rhetoric. I have thus selected for special commendation four sermons from Vol. II and only three from Vol. VII. I do not claim any infallibility for my judgements, but my application of fairly consistent standards would at least seem to suggest that it cannot be assumed that any later sermon is likely to be better, as a whole, than any earlier one, and that, as a basis for the classification of Donne's sermons, 'periods' are just as unsatisfactory as congregations. There are, of course, many sermons which, though not as wholes among Donne's very best, are for various reasons of exceptional interest and importance. I have already ventured to disagree with the editor's

judgement upon Nos. 6 and 18 in Vol. VII. No. 9 in that volume is one of the completest single statements of Donne's theological position; it contains one of his most emphatic rejections of the Calvinist idea of predestination and some of his most memorable definitions of the middle way. No. 13 is interesting both for the long discourse on preaching with which it begins, and for the evidence it affords of the remoteness of mysticism, not only from Donne's experience, but also, one might almost say, from his comprehension (see p. 334).

There are, it seems to me, two great qualities, or powers, which make Donne's sermons what they are and with which, or under which, nearly all his other qualities, both of mind and of style, may be related or subsumed: his power of imaginative realization, which some might be inclined to regard as part of his specifically poetic equipment, and his power of definition, in respect of which he may not unfitly be compared with Hooker. What I call imaginative realization (the phrase is not, I think, my own, but I am very willing to pay a royalty to its inventor) is, as it were, the final cause of all those elaborate varieties of amplification of which Donne is so great a master: he realizes a thought through amplifying and expanding it. The following short and not specially memorable passage will serve as well as any to show how balance, antithesis, climax are all used in the service of amplification and realization:

> A *dogge* murmures not that he is not a *Lion*, nor a *blinde-worm* without eyes, that he is not a *Basilisk* to kill with his eyes; *Dust* murmures not that it is not *Amber*, nor a *Dunghill* that it is not a *Mine*, nor an *Angel* that he is not of the *Seraphim*; and every man would be something else then God hath made him. (Vol. VII, p. 420, ll. 196 ff.)

And this imaginative realization, which expresses itself in and through rhetorical amplification, is intimately related to the technique of the Religious Exercise and Religious Meditation, as recommended by St. Ignatius and by various manuals of devotion. This, I think, becomes especially clear in certain passages where Donne insists that religion consists in what Blake called 'minute particulars'. We find him declaring that to take the merits of Christ in the lump is to take them too much for granted, and that we should try to remember how, at various times, our recollection and contemplation of some one particular part of his passion saved us from committing some one particular sin:

> That at such a particular time, the memory of his fastinge rescued thee from a voluptuous and riotous meetinge, and the memory of his proceedinge and behaviour in his tentations brought thee also to deliver thy selfe by applyinge his word and the promises of the Gospell from those dangerous attempts of the tempter . . . If I mistake not the measure of thy conscience, thou wilt find an infinite comfort in this particular tracinge of the Holy Ghost, and his workinge in thy soule. (Vol. II, p. 159.)

And in a later sermon he urges that we should not pray in general terms, but descend to particulars, since this will lead us to consider each attribute of God and what we have owed to it:

> What God hath done for me in Power, what in Wisedome, what in Mercy;

which is a great assistance, and establishing, and propagation of devotion. (Vol. VII, p. 268.)

A similar power of imaginative realization might perhaps have been exhibited by one whose religion was essentially contemplative and quietist, but Donne combines with it a no less remarkable power of drawing necessary distinctions and disintricating the mean from its extremes. This power of definition, this eye for extremes, may be regarded as a reflection, not merely of his restless and essentially unmystical intellectuality, but also of the intensely practical nature of his religion, of his awareness of the absolute necessity of an organized Church for the exhibition and maintenance of the mean, and it had no doubt been sharpened by his long practice in defending the Anglican *via media* against the extremes of Rome and Geneva. One of his favourite exercises is to define the mean: between superstition and indifference (Vol. II, p. 315), between pampering and maceration of the body (Vol. VII, pp. 106–7), between (a favourite theme) insufficient awareness of God's mercy, leading to 'inordinate dejection of spirit', and insufficient awareness of his justice, leading to a heedless 'security' (Vol. II, p. 164, ll. 10 ff., p. 332, ll. 266 ff.; Vol. VII, pp. 90, 136, 212, 316, ll. 590 ff., pp. 324, 450–1), between lawful and unlawful ambition (Vol. II, p. 292). Nowhere has Donne more succinctly expressed his conception of the *via media*, as a spirit and a temper no less than as a theological position, than in the third of his Prebend Sermons, preached on the text 'And all the upright in heart shall glory'. The upright in heart, he declares, are neither too much in love with life nor too much in love with death, neither indifferent in matters of religion nor inclined to call all who do not believe just as they do heretics; and this way of uprightness and rectitude, in which they walk without diversion, deviation, deflexion, or defection, is

> a plaine, a smooth, an even way, a way that hath been beaten into a path before, a way that the Fathers, and the Church have walked in before, and not a discovery made by our curiosity, or our confidence, in venturing from our selves, or embracing from others, new doctrines and opinions. (Vol. VII, pp. 243–4.)

Donne often has occasion to apply this defining and distinguishing power to more specifically doctrinal matters: to the distinction between matters of faith and matters of opinion (Vol. II, p. 203, l. 238–p. 204; Vol. VII, pp. 97 ff.), which, resting as it does on the conviction that in matters of faith scripture is the sole authority, is explicitly or implicitly present in most of his attacks upon the Roman Church; to the relation between Faith and Works (Vol. II, p. 309; Vol. VII, pp. 228–9, 265, 447), between God's foreknowledge and man's free-will (Vol. II, pp. 151–2; Vol. VII, pp. 155–6), between the strivings of even the most 'rectified' reason and God's prevenient and concomitant and subsequent and 'continuall succeeding' Grace (Vol. II, p. 305; Vol. VII, p. 353). Often in dealing with these matters, and especially when he has occasion to refer to the confident pronouncements of 'Sectaries' about Predestination, Election, and the Eternal Decrees (Vol. II, pp. 170, 323; Vol. VII, pp. 159, 227, 241), Donne rebukes what he calls 'impertinent and inextricable curiosities' (Vol. VII, p. 227, ll. 454–5); for, although he will take endless pains to extract what seems

to him the primary and literal meaning of a text and to exhibit, in all its implications, the truth or doctrine therein, he recognizes that there is a point at which we must be content to allow mysteries to remain mysteries. To some it might often seem that he 'puts by' the problems involved, as Matthew Arnold declared that Wordsworth 'put by' the cloud of mortal destiny; others might rather be inclined to regard his conclusions as examples of that golden common sense, that wisdom, that desire to leave us with something which, as Arnold was fond of saying, we can 'rest upon', which has always been characteristic of the best English moral, religious, and political thought. The following conclusion about the relation between Faith and Works combines, one might say, the best of Luther with the best of Catholicism:

> If I would not serve God, except I might be saved for serving him, I shall not be saved though I serve him; My first end in serving God, must not be my selfe, but he and his glory. . . . If we doe it, (though not because we doe it) we shall have eternall life. (Vol. II, p. 309, ll. 796 ff.)

He often seems to suggest that for those who have truly apprehended the spirit of Christianity many of these 'problems' will seem ludicrously unreal, and that, with a leap of holy joy and confidence, we can reach a point from which we can look down upon them with a smile, as Troilus looked down through the spheres upon the troubles of little Earth. 'Christ', he declares, rejecting the doctrine of Irresistible Grace, 'beats his Drum, but he does not Press men; Christ is serv'd with Voluntaries' (Vol. VII, p. 156, ll. 562–3). If, he declares in another sermon, I were being led to execution and a sealed pardon from the king were brought to me, I should not ask what had moved him to send it, I should just gratefully accept it. And, in order not to *presume* that I am among the elect,

> I come down, and examine my selfe whether I can truly tell my conscience, that Christ Jesus dyed for mee, which I cannot doe, if I have not a desire and an endeavour to conform my self to him; And if I do that, there I finde my Predestination, I am a Christian, and I will not offer to goe before my Master Christ Jesus, I cannot be sav'd before there was a Saviour. (Vol. II, p. 323, ll. 452 ff.)

It is in the same spirit, one of common-sensical impatience with 'impertinent curiosities', that Donne expounds the Anglican doctrine of (or rather, perhaps one should say, the Anglican attitude towards) the Eucharist (Vol. VII, pp. 139–40, 267, 294–6, 320–1, 332, l. 277–p. 333).

> Christ is nearer us, when we behold him with the eyes of faith in Heaven, then when we seeke him in a piece of bread, or in a sacramentall box here. Drive him not away from thee, by wrangling and disputing how he is present with thee; unnecessary doubts of his presence may induce fearfull assurances of his absence: The best determination of the Reall presence is to be sure, that thou be really present with him, by an ascending faith: Make sure thine own Reall presence and doubt not of his: Thou art not the farther from him, by his being gone thither before thee. (Vol. VII, p. 139, ll. 795 ff.)

And in a later sermon:

> What the bread and wine is, or what becomes of it, *Damascen* thinks impertinent

to be inquired. He thinks he hath said enough; (and so may we doe) *Migrat in substantiam animae*; There is the true Transubstantiation, that when I have received it worthily, it becomes my very soule; that is, My soule growes up into a better state, and habitude by it, and I have the more soule for it, the more sanctified, the more deified soule by that Sacrament. (Vol. VII, p. 320, last line–p. 321.)

Donne's sermons have often been praised for their power and brilliance, but not enough, perhaps, for their wisdom. His rare combination of great imaginative and great dialectical power, employed together in the service of a transforming faith, enables him to see and to describe with exceptional clearness where things lead and from what and to what men must be led.

His desire to defend the mean and to castigate extremes often involved him in polemics, especially against the Roman Church, upon which in five sermons in Vol. II and in no less than eleven sermons in Vol. VII there are longer or shorter attacks (Vol. II, p. 100, ll. 183 ff., p. 103, ll. 305 ff., p. 160, ll. 595 ff., p. 300, ll. 493 ff., p. 302, ll. 564 ff., p. 327, ll. 69 ff., p. 360, ll. 442 ff.; Vol. VII, p. 104, l. 380, p. 120, ll. 78 ff., p. 122, l. 170–p. 124, p. 129, l. 407–p. 132, p. 157, ll. 585 ff., p. 158, ll. 623 ff., p. 161, ll. 746 ff., pp. 166–8, 183, l. 711–p. 187, p. 191, ll. 22 ff., p. 294, l. 560–p. 296, p. 309, ll. 324 ff., p. 332, l. 280–p. 333, p. 377, ll. 260 ff., p. 382, ll. 439 ff., p. 387, ll. 616 ff., p. 401, l. 295–p. 403, p. 448, ll. 506 ff.). In many of these attacks there is a kind of Miltonic savagery, and it must be admitted that Donne sometimes chooses very low ground and employs very dubious weapons. He will often introduce some long digression simply in order to lead up to such an attack, and, for one who has learnt by experience to know what is coming, it is amusing to watch both the build-up and Donne's obvious enjoyment. At his best he has much in common with Hooker, but it is impossible to imagine Hooker employing such methods. Here, I repeat (for it seems worth insisting upon, in view of all we have been told about the great differences between them) Donne's affinity is with the polemical Milton.

There is much else in these volumes to which I should have liked to direct the reader's attention, but I will content myself with mentioning a piece of evidence which seems to prove that Donne was at least not accustomed to read the New Testament in Greek. He devotes a great part of Sermon No. 7 in Vol. VII to an attempt to ascertain the exact and literal sense, in 1 Corinthians xv. 29, of the phrase 'baptized for the dead', and finally (pp. 209–10) prefers an interpretation based upon the fact that in the Early Church many people deferred their baptism until their death-beds, so that, when their sins had been washed away, they might have no opportunity of committing more. But although *pro mortuis* could conceivably mean 'as good as dead', *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν* can mean nothing other than 'on behalf of the dead', as Tertullian, whose interpretation Donne rejects (p. 198), was aware.

I conclude with a few suggestions for the further improvement of the text.

Vol. II, p. 69, l. 741, 'thou are still': for 'are' read 'art'. pp. 144 ff., Sermon No. 6, printed from MS. Although the editors have, as they admit, to some extent brought the MS. use of capitals and italics into conformity with that of the printed

texts, they would have been justified in doing the same with certain spellings, such as 'yf', p. 149, l. 203, p. 154, l. 390 ('if' at l. 391), 'yssue', p. 151, l. 249, p. 155, l. 400, 'ynough', p. 152, ll. 305–6. They would also have been justified in occasionally adding punctuation, e.g. p. 148, l. 149, comma after 'promises', l. 152, comma after '*promissionis*', p. 149, l. 179, comma after 'delivered', &c. p. 153, ll. 329–30, 'My heart breaketh for the desire to thy judgments allwaies': if we are to choose between this, the reading of *M*, *D*, *L*, and that of *Dob*, 'for the very desire of thy judgements allwayes', the latter is surely to be preferred. If 'to' in *M*, *D*, *L* is authentic, then 'it hath' must surely have dropped out: 'for the desire it hath to thy judgments allwaies'. The A.V. reads 'for the longing that it hath unto thy judgments at all times', and the Prayer-Book 'for the very fervent desire that it hath alway unto thy judgments'. It is hard to suppose that 'for the desire to' can ever have been idiomatic English. p. 159, ll. 556–60, 'For though the meritt of Christ be a sea, yet be thou content to take it in drop after drop, and to acknowledge in the presence of God, that at such a time (by reducinge them to thy memory and contemplation his Agony) thou wast brought to a sense of thy miserable estate . . .': consideration of the whole passage makes it almost certain that 'meritt' should be 'merits' and 'contemplation his' 'contemplation of his', since the only noun to which 'them' can be related is 'merits'. p. 160, ll. 608–9, 'because it is not literally expressly appointed to others': 'and' has almost certainly been omitted between the two adverbs. p. 161, ll. 637–9, 'And they agree that that place of the Apostle hath relation to his vehement prayer upon the Crosse, *Eli*, *Eli*, My God, my God etc. That when his Father, *non solvit unionem, sed subtrahit extentione*': there should be a comma after 'etc', since 'That' can only mean 'that prayer', and *subtrahit* should perhaps be *subtraxit*. p. 163, ll. 699–700, 'And to conclude, all refractory persons': the editors have here printed the reading (with a comma) which in the Textual Notes they have listed as rejected. (On p. 205, l. 299, 'conclude' is again used in the rare sense of 'convince'). p. 188, ll. 294–5, 'So that all Temporall, and all Spirituall blessings to us, and to the Fathers, were all conferred upon us in Christ': the reading of *Q* and *Dob*, 'our Fathers', is certainly correct and should have been printed; 'the Fathers' could only mean 'the Fathers of the Church'. p. 204, ll. 258–62, 'Without doubt, the Roman Church repents now, and sees now that she should better have preserved her selfe, if they had not denied so many particular things, which were indifferently and problematically disputed before, to bee had necessarily *De fide*, in the Councell of Trent': 'denied' should almost certainly be 'defined' and 'had' should possibly be 'held'. As it stands, the passage is meaningless. p. 228, l. 570, 'Thou are': for 'are' read 'art'. p. 258, ll. 296–300, '(for though the word of consecration alter the bread . . . yet the enunciation of those words doth not infuse nor imprint this grace, which we speak of, into that bread)': for 'word' in the first line read 'words'. p. 263, ll. 478–9, 'that the body of Christ's Church is edified, and alienated by our good life and sanctification': in spite of the editors, I agree with Alford that 'alienated' is impossible, and would suggest 'alimented'. p. 264, ll. 534–5, 'men cannot be sure, that their works is good': the editors leave this, with a query, but a verb in the singular with a subject in the plural, though common enough in poetry, is not, I think, admitted in formal prose. p. 299, ll. 446–7, margin, '*Sequendus in vitae*': for *vitae* read '*vita*'. p. 315, ll. 159–61, 'but then private interests, and private respects create a new indifferency to my apprehension, and calls me to consider that thing as it is in nature': the Quarto of 1634 has 'cal'; if all the manuscripts read 'calls', it may perhaps be taken as evidence that Donne did occasionally, and inadvertently, use a singular verb with a plural subject.

p. 349, ll. 31–32, 'And besides, since the woe in this Text is not S. *Iohns two*? his iterated, his multiplied *two*': for '*two*?' read '*two*,'.

Vol. VII, p. 93, ll. 744–7, 'But whensoever thou shalt grow due to him, by a new, and a true repentance, hee shall re-assume thee, into his bed, and his bosome, *no bill of Divorce*, and re-enter thee into his Revenue, and his Audit, *No bill of sale*, shall stand up to thy prejudice': it is hard not to suppose that the phrase '*no bill of Divorce*' has been misplaced, and that it should immediately precede the phrase '*No bill of Sale*'. p. 225, ll. 363–5, 'Hee hath manifested to us, that that they who goe not the same way, perish': one of the 'that's should be removed. p. 285, ll. 216–17: perhaps add in the margin '[Gal. 6. 14]'. p. 324, ll. 873–4: perhaps add in the margin '[Phil. 2. 12]'. p. 334, ll. 338–41, 'They meane, (and, indeed, some of them say) that a man come to that purity in this life, as that in this life, hee shall bee in possession of that very Beatificall vision': for 'that a man come' read 'that a man may come', as at l. 332 above. p. 352, ll. 95–96, 'God antidates no malediction': is not such a Latinist as Donne more likely to have written 'antedates'? (Cf. p. 374, l. 145.) p. 366, l. 616, 'yes, there is': 'yes' should almost certainly be 'yet', as at l. 614 above. p. 378, ll. 287–8: perhaps add in the margin: '[Mat. 19. 12]'. p. 399, l. 215, 'So the *Scriptures* grew to': for 'to' read 'too'. p. 438, ll. 142–3, 'When, as the world began in a community, that every thing was every bodies, but improved it selfe, to a propriety': ? for 'When, as' read 'Whenas'. p. 442, ll. 289–91: the marginal reference, '[Psal. 115. 1]', has been omitted. p. 442, l. 306, delete comma after '*Holy Ghost*'.

J. B. LEISHMAN

Milton and Forbidden Knowledge. By HOWARD SCHULTZ. Pp. viii+310. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1955; London: Cumberlege, 1956. $5.00; 40*s*. net.

Mr. Schultz has written a background study which he hopes will 'advance a bit the history of ideas' and 'assist the reading of Milton'. He tells us that the book

> gathers together some formulas of piety by which, unwittingly for the most part, preachers and moralists undermined rational science, religious zeal, and historical Christianity.

His texts are *sapere ad sobrietatem* and *philosophiam et inanem deceptionem*, his theme the sins of curiosity (dubious speculation) and vain philosophy (corrupted learning). The book, therefore, as the author hopes, throws some light on seventeenth-century thought and prejudice, and it will assist students of literature to understand some authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Amongst the writers on whom Mr. Schultz has useful comments are Bacon, Sir Thomas Browne, and Marlowe. 'In a sober treatise', we are told,

> a pact-signing wizard would probably have amused Marlowe. But by casting the *curiosus* as such a wizard, by using an easy symbol fit for the stage, he could make his didactic point lively enough to satisfy scholars, politicians, preachers, and citizens.

Mr. Schultz suggests that serious readers of *Paradise Lost* should study Bernard of Clairvaux, whose analysis of Eve's sin may be compared with Milton's presentation of it. He shows that we miss the point if we smile at the way Milton sets his devils 'composing poetry or debating the problems of Scripture', for, of course, 'their song was incomplete', 'their metaphysics inconclusive; their ethics ultimately unsatisfactory'.

Mr. Schultz has a valuable commentary on Raphael's lecture (viii. 1–216), an excellent refutation of those who imagine that Milton ended his life as a Quaker, so wrenching his deepest roots, and, best of all, a discussion on the passage in *Paradise Regained*—so painful to many—in which Christ apparently rejects learning and the liberal arts.

> Milton distinguished carefully between learning itself and the dogma of learning's necessity. Leaving secular learning out of the question altogether, he permitted even ministers to be learned if they pleased. The difference between Satan's position and Christ's is the difference between must and may.

The book displays a remarkable familiarity with the obscure figures of the period, and after reading it we are struck not only by Mr. Schultz's powers of digestion, but also by the transcendence of Milton, who uses the same material as others but with that comprehensive intellectual grasp which Longinus mentioned as one manifestation of the sublime. Mr. Schultz is a reliable guide through the waste land of arid controversies, and most readers will learn a great deal from him.

The book has considerable merits, but it will never attract the general reader to whom the publishers optimistically refer, not because the subject is uninteresting, but because Mr. Schultz deliberately puts obstacles in the path. He is able to coin memorable phrases, but most of his prose is opaque. He does not wear his learning lightly. He packs each paragraph with information and alludes with ostentatious airiness to facts which are not as well known, even to scholars, as he implies. Not all readers of this journal will be able to say why William Twisse may appropriately be called a Job's Comforter, or in what way he 'piously accused God of many sins', who Resbury was, or even before which young king La Milletière argued about the Real Presence. An even greater difficulty, perhaps, is the increasing divergence between English and American academic prose. The style of the best American critics is probably superior to that of their counterparts in England; but some American scholars seem to be unnecessarily obscure. Owing to their rhythm and construction, Mr. Schultz's sentences often develop in unforeseen ways, so that we are forced to read them twice. Finally, it may be mentioned that Mr. Schultz's notes are printed at the back, grouped according to the paragraphs of the text, and supplied only with line-references to lines which are, in fact, unnumbered. This method does not make for ease of reference.

KENNETH MUIR

The Works of John Dryden. Edited by E. N. HOOKER and H. T. SWEDENBERG. Vol. I. Poems 1649–1680. Pp. xviii+414. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1956. 64*s.* net.

There has been no complete edition of Dryden's works since Sir Walter Scott's in 1808; and that, though it remains a monument of critical sympathy and erudition, is out of date and difficult to buy even in Saintsbury's revised version. Students of the poems have had to make do with Sergeaunt's old-spelling text, incomplete and marvellously careless, or with the modernized text and restricted commentary of Professor Noyes. Ker's selection from the essays, no longer adequate, is out of print. Only a few of the plays are accessible in any form whatever. There has been little evidence of building on the bibliographical foundations so truly laid by Mr. Hugh Macdonald in 1939. Investigation of the literary, historical, and philosophical background to Dryden's work has been spasmodic and unco-ordinated. Curiously, this situation does not reflect a widespread indifference to his art: the revival of interest in later seventeenth-century literature, and in the Augustan tradition which Dryden helped to found, has made the need for a new collected edition imperative.

The idea held Professor Hooker's mind 'with a certain insidious compulsion . . . which not even the long vista of eighteen volumes in the Scott-Saintsbury edition could entirely quell'; and unwearied by his strenuous labour on John Dennis, he turned to this new task with assuring energy and enthusiasm. He lived only to see the first volume in print, and to carry his commentary forward to *Absalom and Achitophel*. His sudden death in January 1957, 'when fresh Lawrells courted him to live', was grievous news for all students of Augustan literature, and a heavy blow to the new edition. He had made himself a formidable scholar, and even before the present volume appeared the unrivalled learning and understanding in his essays on the early poems promised a new era in Dryden criticism. His death, an incalculable loss to English scholarship, lies heavy on his friends. He was a modest and spontaneously friendly man, generous to younger scholars, and among his British colleagues as greatly loved as he was respected.

Responsibility for the new edition rests now with Professor Swedenberg. Dr. V. A. Dearing has prepared the text of the early poems with characteristic thoroughness, and special contributions to the commentary have been made by Dr. Godfrey Davis, Dr. S. H. Monk, and others. The work already shows some of the disadvantages of collaboration—a disproportion in the scale of the commentary, and only a blurred impression of editorial personality. But no modern scholar can emulate the solitary achievement of Walter Scott; and here for the first time Dryden is well served both in the scrupulous treatment of his text and in painstaking elucidation of his sense.

The textual editor has normally taken the first edition of each poem as copy text, introducing 'apparently authoritative variants found in other texts . . . as they occur'. His practice is soundly conservative, though I think him sometimes over-cautious in rejecting variants which 'may have been dictated by Dryden,

but . . . may equally well, it would seem, have originated in the printing house'. Repeated checking of his text exposes no serious error, and the few points I have to make are of slight importance. (i) In 'To the Lady Castlemaine', l. 51, he rightly prefers the reading of the second edition, 'Debt *to* Poetry', to 'Debt *of* Poesie'; but why sacrifice 'Poesie', the commoner form in Dryden, to 'Poetry'? (ii) In *Annus Mirabilis*, l. 1115, he emends to 'Not', giving 'Nor' as the reading of all three early editions: my copy of *1688* has 'Not'. (iii) It is not clear why, in the Preface to *Ovid's Epistles*, he prefers 'disappointed' to 'disapointed' (p. 117) but allows 'writen' to stand (p. 109): both spellings of both words are common. (iv) He often reduces a full stop to a semicolon or comma (contrary, I suspect, to Dryden's practice), but in several places (e.g. *Astræa Redux*, l. 76), stops have been allowed to stand where (on Dr. Dearing's principle) they seem wrong.

The critical apparatus and bibliographical notes are exemplary. There appears to be no justification, however, for the second apparatus printed with the textual notes: this comprises the necessary matter already given below the text, together with a mass of immaterial *minutiae*—minor editorial adjustments, punctuation variants, elisions, points which failed to print, 'all errors of any kind repeated from one edition to another', and obvious misprints. It is difficult enough to follow the text, commentary, and footnote apparatus on this scale in one grand devoted operation: it is impossible to keep an eye on the textual notes as well, without getting lost in a waste of insignificance. Dr. Dearing's catalogues of copies collated, with their location and shelf-marks, must be expensive to set; and they are of dubious value here, since the early editions of Dryden's poems are not, in general, rare books. It would have been sufficient to indicate the chief collections used in preparing the text—William Andrews Clark, Folger, Huntington, Harvard, and Yale—and to refer specifically in the notes to copies with textual singularities. The textual editor gives the most exacting reader more than he wants or is happy to pay for. But perhaps this points to a difference in transatlantic attitudes: few British editors would accept all the implications of Miss Darbishire's dictum that 'to know the readings of the first edition it is necessary to read the first edition', but most of them nowadays are anxious to show the reader as little of their rough work as possible.

Earlier editors have not annotated Dryden's early poems with much enthusiasm or care. The content of the new literary commentary, however, is admirable. The editors paraphrase or analyse many passages which baffled their predecessors or deceived them by apparent simplicity: they show Dryden to be more complex, and make him more intelligible, than any previous commentator has done. Their generous illustration of his literary and intellectual affinities places all students of seventeenth-century culture in their debt. There are valuable notes on Dryden's scientific knowledge, and particularly on the difficult astrological references in the early poems. The political context of *Heroique Stanza's* and the Restoration pieces is ably described. A good general study of Dryden and Ovid introduces the *Epistles*. An essay on *Annus Mirabilis*, the best piece of historical criticism in the book, expands Dr. Hooker's earlier article[1] to include

[1] *Huntington Library Quarterly*, x (1946), 49 ff.

Dryden's interest in the work of the Royal Society and his debt to Virgil. It is plausibly argued that the account of the Fire was added in September 1666 to a poem celebrating the naval victories, with 'a slight change in style, and a somewhat more pronounced change in attitude and tone'.

One general criticism must be made: the commentary, like the textual notes, is much too elaborate. Few poets require (or deserve) two crowded pages of notes to fifty lines of verse, and Dryden is not among them. The editors could have jettisoned, without essential loss, much of the *London Gazette* account of the Fire (which is in some respects less helpful than a modern commentator ought to be), much of what Denham and Cowley say on translation (which may now be easily read elsewhere), most of the admittedly fascinating three-page essay on fair women and lazars in painting, and most of the notes on the *Epistles*. They cannot contemplate annotating the *Juvenal* and *Virgil* on this scale! Economies might have been made in many of the shorter notes. The reader of Dryden does not need (though he will enjoy) an account of what happened to Elizabeth Mayerne after the death of Hastings, or more examples of poetical delight in the small-pox, or illustrations of Hoddesdon's addiction to pun and paradox, or a note on Filmer's notions of the origins of sovereignty when 'it is not necessary to suppose that Dryden adopted the theory from Filmer'. It is good to see many of Scott's notes preserved in a modern edition; but Scott is often expansive without being remarkable. Learning and entertainment are everywhere in this commentary, but anxious subscribers will look for signs of a tighter editorial clamp in Volume II.

A few notes require comment. (i) From *Heroique Stanza's*, ll. 57–58 ('His *Palmes* though under weights they did not stand', &c.), commentators have referred to the frontispiece of *Eikon Basilike* with its motto *Crescit sub Pondere Virtus*. The present editors, however, show that the weighted palm was a common emblem of virtue and constancy. I note that the figure had already been applied to Cromwell's achievements in a Latin poem by Mew in *Musarum Oxoniensium Elaiophoria* (1654; reprinted with a translation in *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1702, ii. 3). (ii) *Astræa Redux*, ll. 35–36, is explained as a reference to the episcopal purple and the scarlet of the peers, shown 'like sanguine Dye to Elephants'. But this is a curious inversion, unmarked by the editors, of the common belief that bulls hate scarlet and 'they that govern elephants never appear before them in white' (Jeremy Taylor). (iii) Christie pointed out that 'whiter' in 'times whiter Series' (*Astræa Redux*, l. 292) is a Latinism. Dr. Hooker's additional reference to Vaughan's 'fondness for the word with its Welsh connotations of fair, happy, holy, and blessed' does not seem relevant: the connotations belong to *gwyn*, not to 'white'. (iv) In 'The Prologue at Oxford, 1680', Dryden prophesies the fate of Oxford wits who do not believe in the Plot:

> Your Poets shall be us'd like Infidels,
> And worst the Author of the *Oxford Bells*.

Mr. J. H. Smith, who is responsible for the notes on prologues and epilogues in this edition, repeats Scott's guess that 'the *Oxford Bells*' was 'probably some pasquinade against the Whigs, then current in the University'. But Dryden

but . . . may equally well, it would seem, have originated in the printing house'. Repeated checking of his text exposes no serious error, and the few points I have to make are of slight importance. (i) In 'To the Lady Castlemaine', l. 51, he rightly prefers the reading of the second edition, 'Debt *to* Poetry', to 'Debt *of* Poesie'; but why sacrifice 'Poesie', the commoner form in Dryden, to 'Poetry'? (ii) In *Annus Mirabilis*, l. 1115, he emends to 'Not', giving 'Nor' as the reading of all three early editions: my copy of *1688* has 'Not'. (iii) It is not clear why, in the Preface to *Ovid's Epistles*, he prefers 'disappointed' to 'disapointed' (p. 117) but allows 'writen' to stand (p. 109): both spellings of both words are common. (iv) He often reduces a full stop to a semicolon or comma (contrary, I suspect, to Dryden's practice), but in several places (e.g. *Astræa Redux*, l. 76), stops have been allowed to stand where (on Dr. Dearing's principle) they seem wrong.

The critical apparatus and bibliographical notes are exemplary. There appears to be no justification, however, for the second apparatus printed with the textual notes: this comprises the necessary matter already given below the text, together with a mass of immaterial *minutiae*—minor editorial adjustments, punctuation variants, elisions, points which failed to print, 'all errors of any kind repeated from one edition to another', and obvious misprints. It is difficult enough to follow the text, commentary, and footnote apparatus on this scale in one grand devoted operation: it is impossible to keep an eye on the textual notes as well, without getting lost in a waste of insignificance. Dr. Dearing's catalogues of copies collated, with their location and shelf-marks, must be expensive to set; and they are of dubious value here, since the early editions of Dryden's poems are not, in general, rare books. It would have been sufficient to indicate the chief collections used in preparing the text—William Andrews Clark, Folger, Huntington, Harvard, and Yale—and to refer specifically in the notes to copies with textual singularities. The textual editor gives the most exacting reader more than he wants or is happy to pay for. But perhaps this points to a difference in transatlantic attitudes: few British editors would accept all the implications of Miss Darbishire's dictum that 'to know the readings of the first edition it is necessary to read the first edition', but most of them nowadays are anxious to show the reader as little of their rough work as possible.

Earlier editors have not annotated Dryden's early poems with much enthusiasm or care. The content of the new literary commentary, however, is admirable. The editors paraphrase or analyse many passages which baffled their predecessors or deceived them by apparent simplicity: they show Dryden to be more complex, and make him more intelligible, than any previous commentator has done. Their generous illustration of his literary and intellectual affinities places all students of seventeenth-century culture in their debt. There are valuable notes on Dryden's scientific knowledge, and particularly on the difficult astrological references in the early poems. The political context of *Heroique Stanza's* and the Restoration pieces is ably described. A good general study of Dryden and Ovid introduces the *Epistles*. An essay on *Annus Mirabilis*, the best piece of historical criticism in the book, expands Dr. Hooker's earlier article[1] to include

[1] *Huntington Library Quarterly*, x (1946), 49 ff.

Dryden's interest in the work of the Royal Society and his debt to Virgil. It is plausibly argued that the account of the Fire was added in September 1666 to a poem celebrating the naval victories, with 'a slight change in style, and a somewhat more pronounced change in attitude and tone'.

One general criticism must be made: the commentary, like the textual notes, is much too elaborate. Few poets require (or deserve) two crowded pages of notes to fifty lines of verse, and Dryden is not among them. The editors could have jettisoned, without essential loss, much of the *London Gazette* account of the Fire (which is in some respects less helpful than a modern commentator ought to be), much of what Denham and Cowley say on translation (which may now be easily read elsewhere), most of the admittedly fascinating three-page essay on fair women and lazars in painting, and most of the notes on the *Epistles*. They cannot contemplate annotating the *Juvenal* and *Virgil* on this scale! Economies might have been made in many of the shorter notes. The reader of Dryden does not need (though he will enjoy) an account of what happened to Elizabeth Mayerne after the death of Hastings, or more examples of poetical delight in the small-pox, or illustrations of Hoddesdon's addiction to pun and paradox, or a note on Filmer's notions of the origins of sovereignty when 'it is not necessary to suppose that Dryden adopted the theory from Filmer'. It is good to see many of Scott's notes preserved in a modern edition; but Scott is often expansive without being remarkable. Learning and entertainment are everywhere in this commentary, but anxious subscribers will look for signs of a tighter editorial clamp in Volume II.

A few notes require comment. (i) From *Heroique Stanza's*, ll. 57–58 ('His *Palmes* though under weights they did not stand', &c.), commentators have referred to the frontispiece of *Eikon Basilike* with its motto *Crescit sub Pondere Virtus*. The present editors, however, show that the weighted palm was a common emblem of virtue and constancy. I note that the figure had already been applied to Cromwell's achievements in a Latin poem by Mew in *Musarum Oxoniensium Elaiophoria* (1654; reprinted with a translation in *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1702, ii. 3). (ii) *Astræa Redux*, ll. 35–36, is explained as a reference to the episcopal purple and the scarlet of the peers, shown 'like sanguine Dye to Elephants'. But this is a curious inversion, unmarked by the editors, of the common belief that bulls hate scarlet and 'they that govern elephants never appear before them in white' (Jeremy Taylor). (iii) Christie pointed out that 'whiter' in 'times whiter Series' (*Astræa Redux*, l. 292) is a Latinism. Dr. Hooker's additional reference to Vaughan's 'fondness for the word with its Welsh connotations of fair, happy, holy, and blessed' does not seem relevant: the connotations belong to *gwyn*, not to 'white'. (iv) In 'The Prologue at Oxford, 1680', Dryden prophesies the fate of Oxford wits who do not believe in the Plot:

> Your Poets shall be us'd like Infidels,
> And worst the Author of the *Oxford Bells*.

Mr. J. H. Smith, who is responsible for the notes on prologues and epilogues in this edition, repeats Scott's guess that 'the *Oxford Bells*' was 'probably some pasquinade against the Whigs, then current in the University'. But Dryden

apparently refers to the innocuous popular song on the bells of Oxford attributed to the equally harmless John Aldrich, canon and later Dean of Christ Church, and published in several miscellanies of the time.

The text is finely printed, and luxuriously furnished with facsimile title-pages. The appearance of these would be improved by omitting the conspicuous descriptive footnotes. The modern look of the italicized short title at the head of each poem is discordant. The contents of the book are arranged in chronological order; but prologues and epilogues make up a separate group. This arrangement, which seems to be merely a relic of the old convention of grouping by kinds, may prove inconvenient to editors and readers in later volumes—there are many topical prologues which have their natural place not with other theatrical pieces but with the political poems. It is to be hoped that the editors will reconsider their decision to omit the letters. These are available in C. E. Ward's edition, but they deserve a fuller commentary with liberal cross-reference to Dryden's life and to his other writing.

The editors have interpreted their responsibility generously in giving substantial literary comment on each poem, and in opening a new critical chapter with their detailed discussion of the verse itself. Their essays, which even on the unequal early poems show fine scholarship judiciously applied, should build up to a thorough revaluation of Dryden's art on the grand scale. In quality and in scope this edition promises to be one of the most notable achievements of literary scholarship in this century.

JAMES KINSLEY

Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. Vol. I, 1785–1800, pp. xl+660; Vol. II, 1801–1806, pp. viii+661–1220. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. £5. 5s. net.

The 641 letters contained in these two volumes form the first instalment of a complete collection which will number about 1,800. Hitherto the student of Coleridge has had not merely to use two main collections (E. H. Coleridge's of 1895 and Professor Griggs's *Unpublished Letters* of 1932) but to go to many other books and periodicals for small collections or single letters. If Mr. Griggs had done nothing else than get them all together in chronological order, he would at least have saved all future students of Coleridge from the maddening experience of their predecessors.

He has, of course, done far more. (1) More than 100 of the letters in these two volumes have not been previously printed. The proportion will be higher in later volumes, since the total hitherto unpublished correspondence available is estimated at a third of the whole. (2) He presents a text mainly based on originals: '83 per cent. of the letters in these two volumes is drawn from holographs, 6 per cent. from transcripts and 11 per cent. from printed sources.' In 1932 Mr. Griggs had to use many transcripts of which the originals are among the many manuscript letters he has since discovered. (3) The discovery of these manuscripts made not only for accuracy but for completeness. Many passages had

been omitted from the transcripts. (4) A number of letters are now dated, or rightly dated, for the first time. Examples of correct redating are to be found throughout the volumes. An example of dating for the first time is the letter to Poole of 16 June 1798. This letter was published, with omissions which included the date, in 1888 by Mrs. Sandford in *Thomas Poole and His Friends*. The discovery of the date has repercussions on the chronology of the previous four weeks, e.g. Wordsworth probably saw 'the Castle Spectre' at Bristol in the week beginning Monday, 21 May, not a fortnight later.

The new material is found throughout, but is unevenly distributed. Thus the first 100 letters include only 14 hitherto unpublished (as well as 27 previously published with omissions), whereas of the 67 letters written between Coleridge's leaving home in December 1803 and embarking at Portsmouth in April 1804 as many as 27 are new in their entirety.

The arrangement of the volumes is like that of de Selincourt's edition of Wordsworth's letters. The two volumes are paginated as one, the index comes at the end of the second, there are useful footnotes. On the other hand, in the Wordsworth volumes a list of letters comes at the beginning of each: here there is only one list, at the beginning of Volume I, which is rather tiresome for the steady reader of Volume II.

A steady reading through of the two volumes is richly rewarding. Reviewers who had only time to dip have found Coleridge not one of the best letter-writers. That needs qualification. Coleridge expected some of his letters to be published after his death, and these are no mean specimens of prose writing; e.g. the autobiographical letters to Poole, the letters from Germany (finally edited as *Satyrane's Letters*), and such a letter as that of 13 October 1806 to Clarkson on religion. But the majority of the letters in these two volumes are personal outpourings to which the epistolary art is irrelevant. The full collection here does not change the main problem of Coleridge nor the main impression he makes, but it does intensify both. There are, of course, gaps. Very, very little remains of his letters to Sarah Hutchinson. Some events, notably the enlistment in December 1793, come upon one without the slightest warning or, indeed, explanation. The correspondence is not quite a substitute for a biography, but the record of emotions and the record of illnesses exceed anything to be found in any existing biography. It is impossible to separate the emotions and the illnesses from each other. Whatever the physical basis of the varied and noisome symptoms, here to be read in detail as never before, mental stress had as much to do with them as wet weather. His health deteriorated in Malta from the moment he heard of John Wordsworth's death. He had made a mistaken marriage. Illness prevented him from producing except fitfully: failure to produce must have aggravated illness. Coleridge was born a poet. He made himself a philosopher. In these volumes his temperament and his values are always the poet's. That temperament and those values combined with crass circumstance to create a state of mind and body less and less favourable to poetry. How and why that happened is the problem of Coleridge.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

Herman Melville: Journal of a Visit to Europe and the Levant. October 11, 1856–May 6, 1857. Edited by HOWARD C. HORSFORD. Pp. xiv+300 (Princeton Studies in English 35). Princeton: University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1955. $5.00; 40*s.* net.

This edition seeks to replace a twenty-one-year-old 'very limited edition' (by Raymond Weaver) which is now difficult to obtain. Its purpose, scope, and accuracy go beyond the earlier edition, since Mr. Horsford uses the *Journal* to illustrate both the significant change in Melville's life at this time and the long poem *Clarel*—itself based on the *Journal*—which is now being increasingly understood. Moreover, as one of the few extant Melville holograph manuscripts the *Journal* has interest for the specialist student of the novelist and poet. In fairness I should add that it has considerable attraction for those interested in the processes of literary creation.

One can deduce from his own account that Mr. Horsford's task of elucidation has not been easy; he has successfully surmounted his difficulties and the text, with its variant readings, strata of interlinear alterations, and collection of jottings, is easy to read and not difficult to reconstruct. To this latter end the introductory material is useful to the novice and, in the more technical section, of value to the specialist. The Appendix, containing 'Type facsimiles' of eleven pages of manuscript, and four plates with samples of Melville's manuscript pages, complete the usefulness of a good index. The introduction substantiates the editor's claim that the experiences here recorded were often re-read during the next fourteen years and became a 'living and vital part of his thinking'; the book as a whole makes the understanding of *Clarel* more possible for English readers.

In a modest preface the editor shows that he is consciously steering between the Scylla of too much annotation and the Charybdis of preposterously assuming that his text has unique value. The footnotes are jammed with gratuitous items which displease whenever they fulfil two of the editor's purposes: the one, his determination to illustrate Melville's itinerary from contemporary guide books (surely the subject for a specialist article?), and the other, an editor's besetting sin of all-inclusiveness. Long descriptions from other writers supplement Melville's jerky dismissals of famous places; this is a pity since he never fails, at Constantinople, Jerusalem, Cairo, Rome, or Oxford, to reveal with memorable force the restless search for spiritual integration which reflects the great novels and points forward to *Clarel*. Mr. Horsford accurately assesses this quest in his introduction, but the annotated text so throws the reader off balance that on p. 219 he is grateful that Hawthorne's 'beautifully appreciative description' of the Venus de Medici is 'unfortunately too long to quote'. I would have preferred a more widespread exercise of such restraint in exchange for an explanation of *beauforts* (p. 102) or some explanation of *a wee vestibule* (p. 149) and *a steep wynd* (p. 150).

Having re-read the *Journal* without a glance at the apparatus I found the power of Melville's writing and personality considerably enhanced. Here is revealed his interest in four religions at their true centres, his enormous appetite for paintings and sculpture, his never-failing love for animals and Ishmaels,

and above all, the power of phrase and the depth of insight into the human condition. For the opportunity to understand all this so readily, I am truly grateful to Mr. Horsford.

R. GEORGE THOMAS

Interpretations. Edited by JOHN WAIN. Pp. xvi+238. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955. 25s. net.

The twelve essays on English poems which compose this book have a curiously uneven effect which is irritating. At least one section of each essay could gain universal assent as a valuable comment on the poem it interprets, but most of the essays also contain long paragraphs which seem far removed from any conception of what constitutes the interpretation of a poem. The introduction by Mr. Wain shares this unevenness. Consider these quotations: 'The obvious objection to the competent, well-trained, decent, satisfactory criticism that any University lecturer can turn out by the ream—and does turn it out—is that it is, after all, no *use*; it does not do any good'; 'No, poetry is an impenetrable mystery. And not only "Modern" poetry, which is supposed to be "obscure"! . . . All poetry is obscure to the closed intelligence.' And then just to show that 'modern literary criticism' can be 'seen as an affair of simple responsiveness and common sense' he assembles in this volume twelve critics many of whom are donnish if they are not dons.

Turning to Mr. G. S. Fraser's weighty essay at the book's end we read: 'Nor is the "New Critic" (though he may sometimes look rather like this) simply the old note-maker writ large', or 'I am against the purism of these "New Critics" who want to extrude background information from their examination, or who claim that the necessary background information is always, for a sufficiently sensitive reader, implicit in the poem itself.' Now the contributors to this volume seem to share this ambiguous attitude to the 'New Critics' and can, in my view, be divided into 'Disguised Note-makers' and 'Free-wheelers' respectively. The former include A. Alvarez (on 'The Phoenix and the Turtle'), Graham Martin (on *Macbeth* I. vii. 1–28), Richard Sleight (on 'A Nocturnall Upon S. Lucies Day'), L. D. Lerner (on 'An Horatian Ode'), Christopher Gillie (on 'Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady'), Donald Davie (on 'To a Waterfowl'), Dennis Ward (on 'The Windhover'), and Iain Fletcher (on 'The Dark Angel'); the latter include John Wain (on 'Among School Children'), Charles Tomlinson (on 'Christabel'), W. W. Robson (on 'Resolution and Independence'), Joseph Margolis (on 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock'), and G. S. Fraser (on four lines of Denham and on Wain on Empson's 'The Teasers'). Obviously an attempt has been made to cover styles of all shapes, sizes, and periods and, in particular, both to include longer poems and to avoid exclusive attention to, say, the 'difficult' Metaphysical or the 'obscure' Modern poetry. Even so I wish to state unrepentantly that only two kinds of approach emerge from these twelve-fingered exercises.

First I shall consider one good and one not-so-good example of the 'New

Note-makers': Mr. Gillie and Mr. Fletcher. In his discussion of Pope's elegy Mr. Gillie displays a great deal of sound sense about the relationship between poet and society in Pope's day and shows how this Augustan expectation of what a poet should be and do produces a certain kind of poetic diction. Even more interesting is his method of teasing out the poet's moral attitude to the lady's suicide. But at the end of the essay I sense a refusal to plumb deeper into the first (hidden?) causes of the poem—since the critic himself insists on dragging the poet's views into the poem—and I keep asking myself how this particular essay is different from old-fashioned criticism complete with footnotes. Mr. Fletcher is, confessedly, more vulnerable: 'My own approach to the poem may seem to be overmuch in terms of theology.' He adopts a kind of Lot's-wife look at other ways of treating the poem and 'rather unscrupulously' he says, he has 'gone behind the back of the poem and used two other Latin poems of Johnson's . . . purely in the interest of exegesis, not of evaluation'. After much exegesis, which he admits is 'preliminary to judging whether the poem succeeds', he can yet reach the conclusion 'that the public symbolism is altogether at variance with the poem's inward situation'. The reader is left to wonder why the post-preliminary means of arriving at this conclusion were not also placed at his disposal. Or should one deduce that the critic's first impression on reading the poem guided his quest through the jungle of source material he has displayed up to this point? What follows—the core of interpreting the poem—is a list of names, a ragbag of allusions to poets and poems: eighteen famous names are mentioned in this drumroll of honour, in this device to dodge the poem itself and still reach the essay's inevitable conclusion that 'in art as in religion, there can be no compromise with the destroying Angel, the vision of darkness'.

The most typical 'Free-wheeler' is, perhaps, Mr. Robson on Wordsworth; the most wilful, surely, is Mr. Wain on Yeats. Mr. Robson's essay is allusive in a literary, donnish way and he begins by asserting that the 'poem does not fail'. Thereafter (up to p. 124) his method is to keep on describing his own experience of reading the poem, stanza by stanza, with a highly poetical paraphrase. Then suddenly he runs off into a discussion of a parody of the poem by Lewis Carroll. This is after-dinner criticism, the well-wined good talk which we are all accustomed to and which enables us to anticipate Mr. Robson's reference to the manner of the poem as 'one based upon a personal rehandling of the medium of Spenser—a poet with whom Wordsworth had much in common (Wordsworth had been reading a Spenserian poem, Thomson's *Castle of Indolence*, about this time)'. The critical confusion here displayed vitiates much of the essay that precedes it and pinpoints for me my sense of dissatisfaction with it. So that I am not surprised when the essay ends with even more pleasantly urbane allusions which all lead to a statement about 'the central Wordsworthian sanity and strength'. All this is true and needs to be said by every teacher of English poetry at some point in his tutoring but, one wonders, is it practical criticism? The editor's answer, I am sure, would be that this volume is not a twelvefold demonstration of a rigid method, but a collection of attitudes.

My chief objection to the editor's own handling of 'Among School Children' is exemplified in his first paragraph. It is all about the critic; the poem and the

poet are pushed into the background. Then, as if to confirm this initial impression, the second paragraph launches into a highly personal theory about the relationship between the Ledaean woman and Yeats. So that when, nine pages later, the critic tries to define the precise boundary at which close criticism reaches 'vanishing point' we are not surprised to observe that his criterion of the poem's excellence retreats into a phrase about the 'Yeatsian' use of language. One gets the impression that the critic is too concerned to make his essay a piece of good writing even if, in the process, he wanders far from the poem which has been so carefully printed for us before each essay. Thus although his digression on the 'Romantic Ode' kind of poetry is interesting in itself, it remains commentary which is parallel to Yeats's poem but not congruent to any interpretation of it. Should criticism be a release valve for the critic's creative energy? Should it encourage the tendency, concealed behind the intentions even of the 'Note-makers', to write one's own poem and then attribute the result to the Poet? Disciplined criticism should not prefer a closed circuit of this kind to close reading.

Leaving these four essays to stand as examples of the promise foreshadowed in Mr. Wain's introduction I turn for illumination to Mr. Fraser's concluding essay. At first, in his careful expansion of four lines of Denham, one thinks that he is pulling the reader's leg. 'The "real subject" of the lines is not a poem or a river or a metaphorical relation between the two but a complex and not too fully objectified social attitude, an attitude that seeks to reconcile, in social life, the polarities of nature and artifice.' Now this is either too bafflingly abstruse or too disarmingly trite and issue-dodging. The jargon, and the obvious love of the jargon, can be applied to any piece of writing. But in the second half of the essay Mr. Fraser seems to recover his balance and to say helpful things about the critic's task: 'The point, in fact, of all criticism is to get us to closer and more intelligible grips with an actual work of art.'

Then, alas, he gets bogged down in Professor Empson's verse and in Mr. Wain's examination of 'The Teasers'. The whole analysis is far too heavy (or, viewed another way, too trivial) for the poem to bear. And, what is worse, Mr. Fraser's frequently expressed gratitude to those present when his paper was read uncovers the suspected coterie feeling which underlies the whole book. At this point one realizes that the self-assurance which is so characteristic of all these essays is derived from a feeling of group solidarity and not from the sharing of consistently held (and applied) critical principles which gave a uniform tone to the very best *Scrutiny* criticism. For this final essay trails off into truisms which do not need the ambitious, if welcome, framework of this book to cause their utterance.

What is the function of published literary criticism? For so many of these essayists it is a thinly disguised excuse for exercises in pedagogical instruction in non-poetic lore; for a few it is a plain invitation to outdo the poet in fertility of invention; for none of them, I believe, is it a stirring call to assert vital truths about the place and function of poetry in the place where, and at the time when, the critic is writing. One feels, however misguidedly, that Dr. Leavis's shadow is being good-humouredly exorcised in this occasionally bright book; it would

have been a more valuable book for the present generation of students if a few of the interpreters here on exhibition had even seemed to care about the future of English poetry with half his passionate and austere intensity.

R. GEORGE THOMAS

Studies in Bibliography. Vol. VIII. Edited by FREDSON BOWERS. Pp. iv + 276. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1956. $6.

Again as in the previous volume we are presented with a number of important papers on textual and editorial problems in Shakespeare, and no one who wishes to keep up with the most recent investigations of compositorial analysis can afford to overlook these very careful and cautious studies. There can be no doubt that, as Dr. Alice Walker says, 'recognition of the need to know all that can be discovered about compositors, press-work, and proof-reading has, in fact, undermined in some ways the textual theory of the pre-war years'. Thus the editor of an Elizabethan or seventeenth-century play is at the moment in the difficult position of having to wait until more of these investigations have been completed before he can have any confidence in his assumptions about the habits of his compositors or the kind of copy they were using. For so many of the assumptions that have been made are now shown by these new techniques to have been wholly unfounded. But, however cautiously used, the new methods in their turn do not provide easy answers but open up fresh problems. For instance, even if we can be quite sure that we are dealing with the work of two known compositors, whose different habits can be analysed, we shall naturally find that the character of their work will still vary enormously because of the different kind of copy they have been using. And if we try to check this by examining their work when they are engaged in quite different tasks, when for instance they are reprinting a straightforward prose work from an earlier printed copy, the conditions are so unlike those where they are using manuscript or mixed copy that it is dangerous to draw any conclusions from any observations we may make.

Nevertheless these papers all show what can be done; and the fact that the writers are all fully aware of the delicacy of the problems before them should give us considerable confidence in their conclusions. Dr. Walker in her examination of the text of *Henry V* has shown very clearly what difficulties lie before the editor, not merely in the almost hopeless matter of Elizabethan spellings, but in the more serious problem of substantive emendation; for if Jaggard failed to correct proof with copy, 'fidelity to a Folio text may be no virtue but merely the condonement of vicious errors'. I still find it difficult to believe that in a book like the Folio no corrections were made from the copy, and I wonder whether the apparent absence of such correction could not in part be explained by the unsatisfactoriness of what was certainly the practice later in the seventeenth century, namely, that the corrector of the press checked the proofs while the copy was read to him. Such a method would at least indicate that the corrector was entirely uninterested in the spelling of his copy, and did not bother to normalize variations introduced by different compositors.

The full possibilities of bibliographical analysis are courageously set forth in Philip Williams's 'New Approaches to Textual Problems in Shakespeare'; and we should certainly do well to follow his suggestion that 'the more closely compositor analysis is related to other approaches, the more productive it will be'. Some of these investigations are, as he says, often unrewarding, but it is possible that the full analysis of the press-work of the Folio may produce some useful results.

A good example of compositorial analysis is provided in the paper on the compositors in *Titus Andronicus* Q2. It was set by two men whose work has been identified in two other Roberts quartos, the *Merchant of Venice* in the same year and *Hamlet* Q2 four years later. And it shows them here at work on a reprint of a previous edition. In spite of the fact that this necessarily distorts the picture of their habits, this investigation is carried out with great skill, and provides sufficient evidence to reconstruct the rather complicated pattern of work assigned to the two men. And the suggestion is made that X, who is responsible for setting only a third of the work, 'was called in to help while Y was distributing the type from a forme that already had been printed'.

In a further study of the folio text of *Henry V* Andrew Cairncross has made an ingenious attempt to demonstrate that copy was prepared for the two compositors by using the printed pages of Q2 and Q3, with manuscript corrections and additions written in. He has no difficulty in showing that many minute features of the printed text of Q2 and Q3 are preserved in the folio, and in a series of illustrations he has provided examples of how this could actually be done, even in passages where the most numerous alterations occur. But the forbidding appearance of these pages may, I am afraid, make some of his readers slow to accept his theory.

Professor Bowers has added a new excitement to the game of bibliographical analysis by providing a long article containing a masterly analysis of the textual relation of Q2 to Q1 *Hamlet*, with an Appendix A, presumably the first of a series of illustrative tables, which sweeps us along through a series of arguments pointing to certain conclusions, only to break off just before we reach them with the promise that it will be concluded, presumably in next year's issue.

Mr. Arthur Brown contributes a very useful discussion of editorial problems in his challenge to the editors of semi-popular editions of Shakespeare's plays for the use of schools and the general reader, where the text has to be modernized, 'for more commonsense and less virtuosity' and for some 'suppression of a too exuberant editorial personality in favour of a sober and authoritative presentation of reliable conclusions'. Mr. John Russell Brown completes his account of 'the Printing of John Webster's Plays' by listing all the press-variants he has found after collating all available copies of *The White Devil*, *The Duchess of Malfi*, and *The Devil's Law Case*. From this he has been able to demonstrate the habits of two compositors in Okes's printing house, and has some interesting things to say on the effect of using 'professional clearly written manuscript copy'.

Such speculations make us wish that a little more evidence were available from the survival of printers' copy; and some readers will turn with excitement to Mr. Bond's account of 'A Printer's Manuscript of 1508', which contains the

author's, editor's, and printer's corrections and markings. Four pages are reproduced of the beautiful manuscript of Pontanus, *De Prudentia*, from which the folio edition was printed; and a fascinating account is given of the work of the editor, who was obviously concerned in his alterations in the text and in his directions to the press not only with the accuracy of the edition but with the handsomeness of the printed page.

Mr. Robert L. Haig offers some new information about the King's Printing Office from an investigation of Chancery documents connected with proceedings they instituted against infringement of their rights during the period 1680–1730. It includes an inventory of the King's Printing Office in April 1720, but this unfortunately gives no details of the equipment, 'Printing Letter, presses & other materials' valued at over £1,828, or the paper, valued at £700.

There are three contributions on American subjects, of which the most interesting is Mr. Linton Massey's 'Notes on the Unrevised Galleys of Faulkner's *Sanctuary*', in which he attempts to explain what happened to the original text, written in the summer of 1929, but set aside until the next year owing to the publisher's doubts of its being printable. When the author saw the galleys he thought it so terrible that he either had to tear it up or rewrite it. The whole story of the revision is set out here. The technical papers that, with the annual Checklist, conclude the volume offer considerable variety, from notes on the 1479 Oxford edition of Aristotle's *Ethics* to 'Patterns in Press Figures in Lyttleton's *Dialogues of the Dead*' elucidated by Mr. William B. Todd; and an account of Whitman's letters to Whitelaw Reid, editor of the *New York Tribune*, from papers recently deposited in the Library of Congress by the Reid family.

It must be said again that this volume of *Studies in Bibliography* from the University of Virginia contains, as we have come to expect, a very large proportion of the research now being undertaken in this subject.

HERBERT DAVIS

SHORT NOTICES

William Langlands Verhältnis zum Zisterziensischen Mönchtum. By HELMUT MAISACK. Pp. 142. Balingen: Daniel, 1953.

The purpose of this study is twofold: to demonstrate the almost exclusively Bernardine or Cistercian character of Langland's thought, and to offer an interpretation of the *Vita* (B. VIII–XX) in those terms.

It cannot fairly be said that the author has succeeded in the first of these aims. Cistercian influence seems to be assumed chiefly on the basis of Langland's use of the ploughman figure: after a brief account of the Cistercian movement of the twelfth century with its emphasis on manual labour, Dr. Maisack moves at once to his analysis of Passus VIII. Here, even the rather arbitrary handling of Langland's ideas in the first part of the passus hardly prepares us for the positive identification, a few pages later, of Dowel in the second part of the passus with a Cistercian lay brother and Dobet with a Cistercian monk. These hypotheses—for such they must be—are soon taken for granted; by p. 33 the author is committed to an interpretation of the poem exclusively in terms of Cistercian thought and history. (He shows himself aware that Langland at times reflects the thought of the Victorines; but this, too, is related to the Cistercians.) Further on, Langland himself is

assumed to have been a Cistercian lay brother; and the interesting suggestion is made at the end that the 'emancipation' of these *conversi* in the fourteenth century greatly contributed to the Peasants' Revolt of 1381.

Whatever synthesis and distinctive expression of Christian thought St. Bernard achieved was widely disseminated by the fourteenth century. Dr. Maisack could have illustrated all the Bernardine doctrines he finds in Langland in a manner nearer to Langland's expression of them from writings contemporary with *Piers Plowman*, such as Bromyard's *Summa Praedicantium*; and he would have found in those, too, other anticipations of Langland's thought. Professor Owst, of whose work Dr. Maisack shows no recognition, demonstrated in 1933 how faithfully Langland reproduces the popular preaching of his age, even in his choice of Piers Plowman as spiritual leader and symbol of Christ.

In effect, this study is an interpretation of the *Vita* in the B-text against a background of selected Christian ideas, accepted in the fourteenth century, but here illustrated mainly from earlier Cistercian sources. Largely because of the narrow frame within which he forces his commentary, the author begs many questions; and for that reason his interpretation can scarcely be described as conclusive. Nevertheless, it is always interesting and deserves attention.

T. P. DUNNING

Ikon: John Milton and the Modern Critics. By ROBERT MARTIN ADAMS. Pp. xx+232. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1955. 30s. net.

Professor Adams has set out to be lively; but the amusement which can be extracted from academic debate is not only thin in itself, but usually involves lifting a good many heavy weights. Thus Mr. Adams succeeds best with those critics who are, as Miltonists, light weights, whether it is Mr. Cleanth Brooks writing on *Comus* or Professor Empson on Bentley. But the longest essay is rashly devoted to 'The Text of Paradise Lost', and attempts to cast doubt on the competence of Milton's editors, from Masson to Miss Darbishire. We are asked to believe that the distinctive appearance of the original texts, and differences between the first and second editions of *Paradise Lost*, are due to chance. We are told that Milton 'was not a particularly careful speller, even among authors of his day' (p. 74), and that he must be freed from 'the mare's nest of picayune spelling problems' (p. 76). When Mr. Adams goes on to consider emendations, he is chiefly concerned to argue that editors should work to no fixed principle and form no theory as to the authority of the early editions. The freedom he thus claims is perhaps illustrated by one of his own proposals, to change 'describ'd' to 'descried' in *Paradise Lost*, iv. 567–8, where Uriel reports of Satan that

> I describ'd his way
> Bent all on speed.

It is, he says, 'an uneconomical and distracting practice to continue . . . a form which not only misrepresents the author's plain intention and constant practice, but encumbers the poetry itself' (p. 101). But this bluster does not alter the fact that Mr. Adams would simply substitute one word for another, because the text as it stands demands a footnote. Perhaps it is unfair to take this as typical of the critic's feeling for Milton's style, for elsewhere he shows an appreciation of the effect of such forms. But the example may suggest that some blunting of perception may result from too constant a 'debunking' of one's fellow-scholars.

Mr. Adams is indeed badly served by the tone of nagging contention in which he always writes, even when he is merely surveying the debate on Milton's supposed Rabbinical studies, or on his supposed debt to Sylvester's Du Bartas. The disadvantages of the medium become obvious when the writer really has something of his own to say, as Mr. Adams intermittently does; we may see this clearly in the last section, on 'Milton's Verse'. Like many of the titles, this gives little indication of the actual contents; here we have a discussion of Milton's temperament and beliefs. And here, despite the usual defensive and offensive

movements, one is finally persuaded that Mr. Adams is a more perceptive and balanced and serious critic than he has for the most part allowed himself to appear. One hopes that, if he has now fought his way through the hedge of thorns he has so industriously assembled from modern critics and scholars, he may one day commit the indiscretion of writing a book about Milton.

F. T. PRINCE

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA
Band 74, Heft 4, 1956
Das Spätwerk Max Försters, eine Bibliographie (T. Göhler), 416–26.
The Problem of Short Diphthongs in OE. (G. Bauer), 427–37.
ME. Overlapping of V and W and its Phonemic Significance (B. Sundby), 438–44.
Bestiary, 345 f. (H. C. Matthes), 445–8.
Pall Mall (F. Norman), 449–50.

ENGLISH STUDIES
Vol. xxxviii, No. 3, June 1957
Relative Clauses in Educated Spoken English (R. Quirk), 97–109.
Gender in *Peterborough Chronicle* 1070–1154 (C. Clark), 109–15.
Current Literature, 1956 (F. T. Wood), 130–8.
Points of Mod.E. Syntax (P. A. Erades), 139–42.

Vol. xxxviii, No. 4, August 1957
Snake-swords and Boar-helms in *Beowulf* (A. T. Hatto), 145–60.
A Rare Use of 'Honour' as a Criterion of Middleton's Authorship (C. L. Barber), 161–8.
Notes on the ME. *Genesis and Exodus* (O. S. Arngart), 169–73.
Points of Mod.E. Syntax (P. A. Erades), 187–9.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM
Vol. vii, No. 3, July 1957
F. R. Leavis's 'How to Teach Reading' (D. Davie), 231–41.
Atavism and Anticipation in Shakespeare's Style (E. Schanzer), 242–56.
The Ambivalence of Gray's Elegy (A. E. Dyson), 257–61.
On the Logic of Romanticism (A. Gérard), 262–73.
The Critical Forum: Restoration Comedy, Banquo and Edgar, Shakespeare in the Theatre, Charles Williams, 318 ff.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES
X^e Année, No. 2, avril-juin 1957
Malory's Use of *Le Morte Arthur* and *Mort Artu* (R. M. Lumiansky), 97–108.
Sir Arthur Conan Doyle et la France (P. Weil-Nordon), 109–14.
Donne, l'amour et les critiques (P. Legouis), 115–22.
Le Centenaire de la naissance de Bernard Shaw (L. Eyrignoux), 123–7.
Un Inédit de Walt Whitman: 'Taine's History of English Literature' (R. Asselineau), 128–38.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES
Vol. lxxii, No. 4, April 1957
Hall's Edition of the ME. *Bestiary* (O. J. Emory), 241–2.
The Prioress's Greatest Oath (J. J. Lynch), 242–9.
Spenser's Atin from *Atine?* (A. K. Hieatt), 249–51.
Three Notes on Shakespeare [*T.N.*, v. i. 224; *Lear*, IV. ii. 39; *1 H. IV*, II. i. 2.] (C. Camden), 251–3.
Volpone and the Authorship of *Eastward Hoe* (J. I. Cope), 253–6.
Milton's Amarant (D. C. Allen), 256–8.
Swift, the Non-Jurors, and Jacobitism (D. P. French), 258–64.
Shakerly Marmion and Pope's *Rape of the Lock* (J. I. Cope), 265–7.
The Clandestine Marriage and its Hogarthian Associations (H. E. Gerber), 267–71.
'Neblaretai' and 'Rattei' in Browning's *Aristophanes' Apology* (C. Dahl), 271–3.
A Poem by Swift and Yeats's *Words Upon the Window-Pane* (E. R. Miner), 273–5.
Joyce's 'A Little Cloud' (C. Short), 275–8.

Vol. lxxii, No. 5, May 1957
The Emendation 'Oreðes ond Attres', *Beowulf*, 2523 (J. C. Pope), 321–8.
The Date of Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* (G. Cross), 328–32.
The Definition of Sin in Donne's *Biathanatos* (A. E. Malloch), 332–5.
Ammianus and Alpheus: The Sacred River (J. M. Patrick), 335–7.
The English 'Maupassant School' of the 1890's (G. J. Worth), 337–40.

Some Sources of Henley's *Echoes* (A. F. Braunlich), 341–2.
Apple Imagery in Yeats's *The Song of Wandering Aengus* (J. L. Mazzaro), 342–3.

Vol. lxxii, No. 6, June 1957
The Genesis of Drayton's Ode *To the Virginian Voyage* (G. Friedrich), 401–6.
Horatio's Report to Hamlet (W. E. Farrison), 406–8.
'Traitor' in *All's Well* and *Troilus and Cressida* (J. L. Halio), 408–9.
An Instance of Milton's Use of Time (E. Reiss), 410–12.
Symbol and Meaning in Blake's *The Little Black Boy* (J. H. Adler), 412–15.
Wordsworth's *Prelude*, I. 1–269 (C. Moorman), 416–20.
The Gnomonic Clue to Joyce's *Dubliners* (G. Friedrich), 421–4.
The 'Fool' in *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock* (M. M. Blum), 424–6.
Buddhistic Overtones in Eliot's *The Cocktail Party* (R. B. Shuman), 426–7.
Philostratus' *Imagines* and Alciato's *Emblemata* (K. L. Selig), 427–8.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY
Vol. xviii, No. 2, June 1957
Trappolin Supposed a Prince and *Measure for Measure* (H. A. Kaufman), 113–24.
The 'Fears' of Keats (M. A. Goldberg), 125–31.
A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Year 1956 (P. A. Brown), 132–55.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW
Vol. lii, No. 3, July 1957
Misconception Concerning Influence of Marino on Crashaw (L. Pettoello), 321–8.
Robert Heron and Wordsworth's Critical Essays (A. A. Mendilow), 329–38.
Two Passages in *Sawles Warde* (G. K. W. Johnston), 384–6.
An Icelandic Custom and an English Proverb (V. G. Salmon), 386–9.
Wyatt and Petrarch (D. G. Rees), 389–91.

MODERN PHILOLOGY
Vol. liv, No. 4, May 1957
'Sin' and the Serpent of Genesis 3: *Paradise Lost*, II. 650–3 (J. M. Steadman), 217–20.
Two New Pieces by Johnson in the *Gentleman's Magazine*? (J. Leed), 221–9.
Space-Time Polarity in *Finnegans Wake* (S. K. Kumar), 230–3.
Victorian Bibliography for 1956 (F. G. Townsend), 234–69.

NOTES AND QUERIES
Vol. iv, N.S., No. 5, May 1957
Hall's 'Byting Satyres', 190–1.
Dramatic Pointing in *The Yorkshire Tragedy*, 191–2.
The Revenger's Tragedy and the Medici family, 192–3.
King Lear and *Selimus*, 193–4.
True madness (*Hamlet*, II. ii. 92–95), 194–6.
'The Dorian mood' in *Paradise Lost*, 196–7.
Dryden, Donne, and Cowley, 197–8.
More's *Historie of Kyng Rycharde III* and *Lust's Dominion*, 198–9.
Dryden and Henry Heveningham, 199–203.
A sonnet not Defoe's, 208–10.
Johnson and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 210–13.
Johnson's last letter to William Windham, 213.
Coleridge and Mary Hutchinson, 213–14.
George Mudie: journalist and Utopian, 214–16.
Unpublished letters of M. G. Lewis, 217–19.
Poe and *Kubla Khan*, 219–20.
Poe's *Fall of the House of Usher*, 220–1.
Marston's vocabulary (xi), 221–3.

Vol. iv, N.S., No. 6, June 1957
Two corrections of *S.T.C.*, 232.
Benlowes, Brome, and the Bejewelled Nose, 232–3.
'Whan that Aprill(e)', 234–7.
The Zanzis quotation in *Troilus and Criseyde* (IV. 415), 237.
A Shakespearian gloss: 'Accommodate' (*Lear*, IV. vi. 81), 237–8.
Alleged crux in Chaucer ('Lollius'), 238–9.
Rhetoric and ridicule in the 18th century, 239.
The death of Falstaff, 240.
John Ford, 241.
Defoe's ancestry, 242.
The entry into English of 'analysis' and 'pathos', 242–3.
Manningham, Marston, and Alderman More's wife's daughter, 243–4.
An obscure reference to wool processing in *The Fair Maid of the Exchange*, 244–5.
Paradise Lost and the mortalist heresy, 250–1.
Dryden and Pyrrhonism, 251–2.
Smollett editions in 18th-century Britain, 252.
Six notes on *The Rape of the Lock*, 252–4.
Wordsworth's *Essay upon Epitaphs*, 254–5.

Two notes on Sterne, 255–6.
Fielding and South's 'luscious morsel', 256–7.
Tony Weller's trade, 260–3.
Blunders about Blackwood, 263–5.
Joseph Hunter on the Hazlitts, 265–6.
Master Hugues of Saxe-Gotha, 266.

Vol. iv, N.S., No. 7, July 1957
The little clergeon's *Alma redemptoris mater*, 277.
'Lusty Malyne' in *The Reeve's Tale*, 277–8.
The 'suttell and dissayvabull' world of Chaucer's *Troilus*, 278–9.
'Sallied' flesh in *Hamlet*, 279–80.
The Earl of Oxford and the Queen's English, 280–3.
Marston's vocabulary (xii), 283–5.
Henry Swinburne and Shakespeare, 285–6.
Sir John Hayward, 288–90.
Sir George Buck, Master of the Revels, 290–2.
The Maydes Metamorphosis, 292–3.
Some lines by Samuel Rowlands, 293.
Milton, Nathanael Carpenter, and Satan, 293–5.
Cartwright's human sacrifice scene in *The Royal Slave*, 295–6.
Marvell and the Third Dutch War, 296–7.
Alexander Pennecuik: two MSS., 297–8.
Addison and the Duke of Somerset, 298–9.
An unpublished poem by Robert Dodsley, 301–3.
Rasselas and *The Vicar of Wakefield*, 303–5.
Blunders about Blackwood, 307–8.
Collier's fabrications, 309–12.
Yeats's *Byzantium*, Dante, and Shelley, 312–13.
Willa Cather and A. E. Housman, 313–14.
Conrad: a misdated letter, 314–15.
'Intermediaries' of German literature in 19th-century Britain, 315–16.

Vol. iv, N.S., No. 8, August 1957
Sir George Buck, Master of the Revels, 324–7.
Mythical wars of King Ceolwulf, 327.
Place-names derived from the *solandae* of St. Paul's, 327–9.
Roger Ascham, Margaret Rampston, and Salisbury Hall, 332–3.
Gorboduc and Grafton's *Chronicle*, 333.
Errour and herpetology (*Faerie Queene*, I. i. 20), 333–4.
Balthasar, Daniel, and Portia, 334–5.
A possible textual corruption (*Tempest*, III. ii. 14–16), 335.
Authorship of *The passionate mans Pilgrimage*, 335–6.
Shakespeare in France, 336.
The first stanza of Donne's *Hymne to God my God, in my Sicknesse*, 336–7.
William Walker's *Treatise of English Particles*, 337–8.
Sir John Bernard or Barnard, 338–9.
Goldsmith and *The Universal Museum and Complete Magazine*, 339–48.
Dr. Johnson and the art of flying, 348–51.
Dr. Johnson and *An Authentic Account of the Present State of Lisbon*, 351.
Nichols's *Anecdotes of Hogarth* and Horace Walpole, 352–3.
The Vanity of Human Wishes, ll. 15–20, 353–4.
The Vanity of Human Wishes, l. 125, 354.
Early references to the 'Black Country', 354–6.
G. H. Lewes and *Daniel Deronda*, 356–8.
Gissing's *Veranilda*, 359.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY
Vol. xxxvi, No. 2, April 1957
The Romantic Movement: A Selective and Critical Bibliography for 1956, 97–182.
Christabel: The Vision of Fear (E. E. Bostetter), 183–94.
Blake's *Tiriel* and the State of Experience (R. F. Gleckner), 195–210.
Robert Bage: Novelist of Ideas (J. H. Sutherland), 211–20.
Warburton and the Search for the Primitive in 18th-century France (C. Cherpack), 221–33.
The Institucion of a Gentleman and Carion's *Chronicles* (D. T. Starnes), 244–52.
A MS. of Ralegh's *The Scepticke* (R. H. Popkin), 253–9.
Dating Donne's *La Corona* (D. Novarr), 259–65.
Herbert's *The Church Militant* and the Chances of History (D. Levang), 265–8.
W. R. Greg and Mrs. Gaskell (D. Shusterman), 268–72.
A Victorian Anticipation of Recent Scott Criticism (R. C. Gordon), 272–5.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
Vol. lxxii, No. 2, April 1957
Annual Bibliography for 1956, 133–402.

Vol. lxxii, No. 3, June 1957
Paradigms for English Verbs (R. B. Long), 359–72.
Addison's Aristocratic Wife (A. L. Cooke), 373–89.

Wordsworth's 'minuteness and fidelity' (J. E. Jordan), 433–45.
Freuds Aesthetik (L. Marcuse), 446–63.
Dickens's Use of his American Experiences in *Martin Chuzzlewit* (H. Stone), 464–78.
Whitman's 'Lilacs' and the Tradition of Pastoral Elegy (R. P. Adams), 479–87.
Browning's Witless Duke (B. R. Jerman), 488–93.
The Strange Irregular Rhythm: An Analysis of *The Good Soldier* (E. B. Gose, Jr.), 494–509.
Yeats's *Country of the Young* (H. Adams), 510–19.
Shaw, Bunyan, and Puritanism (N. F. O'Donnell), 520–33.
Joyce's Use of Swift's *Polite Conversation* in the 'Circe' Episode of *Ulysses* (M. L. Jarrell), 545–54.

SEWANEE REVIEW
Vol. lxv, No. 3, Summer 1957
English Poetry: The Immediate Situation (J. Wain), 353–74.
The Pattern of the *Pisan Cantos* (F. Read), 400–19.
The Linked Analogies of *Richard II* (J. A. Bryant, Jr.), 420–33.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY
Vol. liv, No. 2, April 1957
Emblem Books on Literature's Role in the Revival of Learning (R. J. Clements), 85–100.
Hieronimo Explains Himself (J. D. Ratcliff), 112–18.
On the Date of *King John* (R. A. Law), 119–27.
Dramaturgical Norms in the Elizabethan Repertory (W. W. Main), 128–48.
Shakespeare's Antony: A Study of Image Themes (M. Charney), 149–61.
The Ambiguity of Bosola (C. G. Thayer), 162–71.
Milton's *In Quintum Novembris*: An Epic Foreshadowing (M. Cheek), 172–84.
Literature of the Renaissance in 1956: A Bibliography, 185–358.

The Victorian Bibliography hitherto carried by *Modern Philology* is to be discontinued. This feature will now appear in *Victorian Studies*, a new journal which is to be published by Indiana University.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

January—June 1957

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1957 the date of each publication.]

ANDERSON, Q. The American Henry James. New Brunswick. pp. xiv + 370. $6.50.
ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. Vol. XXVIII, 1948, pp. xiv + 260, ed. H. Pettit and A. Macdonald. 35*s*.
ARMYTAGE, W. H. G. Sir Richard Gregory. pp. x + 242. 21*s*.

BAKER, C. Hemingway. [2nd edn.] Princeton, 1956; London. pp. xx + 356. 40*s*.
BAYLISS, A. E. M. and J. C. Science in Fiction. pp. 192. 5*s*.
BAZIRE, J., and COLLEDGE, E. (eds.). The Chastising of God's Children and The Treatise of Perfection of the Sons of God. Oxford. pp. x + 360. 42*s*.
BERNDT, R. Form und Funktion des Verbums im nördlichen Spätaltenglischen. Halle, 1956. pp. 312. DM. 27.30.
BEYER, H. History of Norwegian Literature. New York, 1956. pp. x + 370. $6.50.
BLACKMUR, R. P. The Lion and the Honeycomb. pp. viii + 310. 25*s*.
BLAKE, W. Selected Poems, ed. F. W. Bateson. pp. xxxii + 144. 9*s*. 6*d*.
BOKLUND, G. The Sources of *The White Devil*. Uppsala. pp. 226. Kr. 19; 25*s*.
BRANAM, G. C. Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearean Tragedy. Berkeley, 1956. pp. viii + 220. $3.25.
BREDSDORFF, E. Hans Andersen and Charles Dickens. Cambridge, 1956. pp. 140. 25*s*.
BREDVOLD, L. I. The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden. [Reissue.] Ann Arbor, 1956; London. pp. vi + 186. $1.25; 9*s*. 6*d*.
BURKE, E. A Note-Book, ed. H. V. F. Somerset. pp. xii + 120. 18*s*. 6*d*.
BUTT, J., and TILLOTSON, K. Dickens at Work. pp. 238. 25*s*.

CAREY, G. V. Punctuation. Cambridge. pp. vi + 42. 3*s.* 6*d.*

CHAPMAN, G. Homer, ed. A. Nicoll. Vol. I, pp. xxii + 742; Vol. II, pp. xvi + 654. 63*s.*

CONFERENCE ON MATERIALS FOR RESEARCH IN AMERICAN CULTURE, OCTOBER 1956. PROCEEDINGS. Austin. pp. 48.

COX, S. A Swinger of Birches. A Portrait of Robert Frost. New York. pp. xiv + 178. $3.75.

CRASHAW, R. Poems, ed. L. C. Martin. [2nd edn.] Oxford. pp. xciv + 476. 45*s.*

DOBSON, E. J. English Pronunciation 1500–1700. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. xxiv + 444; Vol. II, pp. vi + 445–1078. 168*s.*

ENGLISH ASSOCIATION. Essays and Studies, 1957, coll. Margaret Willy. pp. 122. 12*s.* 6*d.*

ENKVIST, N. E. The Seasons of the Year. Chapters on a Motif from Beowulf to the Shepherd's Calendar. Copenhagen. pp. viii + 220.

FARNHAM, W. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. [Reprint.] Oxford, 1956. pp. xiv + 488. 35*s.*

GALINSKY, H. Amerikanisches und britisches Englisch. Munich. pp. viii + 96. DM. 7.90.

GELL, SIR W. Reminiscences of Sir Walter Scott's Residence in Italy, 1832, ed. J. C. Corson. Edinburgh; London. pp. xxii + 56. 10*s.* 6*d.*

GERSTNER-HIRZEL, A. The Economy of Action and Word in Shakespeare's Plays. Bern. pp. 134. Fr. 13.50.

GIFFIN, M. Studies on Chaucer and his Audience. Hull, Quebec, 1956. pp. 130. $4.75.

GOETHE, J. W. VON. Letters, tr. M. von Herzfeld and C. M. Sym. Edinburgh. pp. xxxviii + 574. 42*s.*

GRAFF, W. L. Rainer Maria Rilke. Princeton, 1956; London. pp. x + 354. 48*s.*

HILEN, A. (ed.). The Diary of Clara Crowninshield. The European Tour of Longfellow 1835–1836. Seattle, 1956. pp. xxxvi + 304. $5.00.

HISCOCK, W. G. John Evelyn and his Family Circle. 1955. pp. xii + 256. 25*s.*

HOGAN, C. B. Shakespeare in the Theatre 1701–1800. Vol. II. A record of performances in London 1751–1800. Oxford. pp. xii + 798. 70*s.*

HUNT, L. Literary Criticism, ed. L. H. and C. W. Houtchens. New York; Oxford, 1956. pp. xiv + 732. 45*s.*

JOYCE, J. Letters, ed. S. Gilbert. pp. 438. 42*s.*

KERMODE, F. Romantic Image. pp. xii + 172. 18*s.*

KETTON-CREMER, R. W. Matthew Prior. pp. 26. 3*s.* 6*d.*

KINNEAVY, J. L. A Study of Three Contemporary Theories of Lyric Poetry. Washington, 1956. pp. viii + 176. $2.00.

KNIGHT, E. W. Literature Considered as Philosophy. The French Example. pp. xvi + 240. 25*s.*

KNOX, R. A. On English Translation. Oxford. pp. 26. 2*s.* 6*d.*

LARRABEE, S. A. Hellas Observed. New York. pp. xvi + 358. $6.00.

LEGOUIS, E. Edmond Spenser. [New edn. revd. P. Legouis.] Paris, 1956. pp. xvi + 384.

LEWIS, C. DAY. The Poet's Way of Knowledge. pp. 32. 5*s.*

LINSALATA, C. R. Smollett's Hoax: Don Quixote in English. Stanford, 1956. pp. x + 116. 22*s.*

LOMBARDO, A. Il Dramma Pre-Shakespeariano. Venice. pp. 232. L. 1500.

LÜTHI, M. Shakespeares Dramen. Berlin. pp. 474. DM. 20.

MACDONALD, A. H. Richard Hovey. Durham, N.C.; London. pp. xiv + 266. 37*s.* 6*d.*

MAHOOD, M. M. Shakespeare's Wordplay. pp. 192. 15*s.*

MALE, R. R. Hawthorne's Tragic Vision. Austin. pp. x + 188. $3.75.

MARSHALL, T. F. (ed.). Literature and Society 1950–1955. A Selective Bibliography. Miami, 1956. pp. x + 56.

MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Part A. 3. Ann Arbor, 1956; London. pp. 253–380. 21*s.*

MILTON, J. Poems, 1645, ed. C. Brooks and J. E. Hardy. pp. xxii + 354. 25*s.*

MOORE, H. T. Poste Restante. A Lawrence Travel Calendar. Berkeley, 1956; London. pp. xviii + 104. 26*s.*

MOORMAN, M. William Wordsworth. The Early Years, 1770–1803. Oxford. pp. xvi + 632. 50*s.*

MUIR, K. Shakespeare's Sources. Vol. I. Comedies and Tragedies. pp. xii + 268. 25*s.*

NICOLL, A. The Elizabethans. pp. viii + 174. 25*s.*

NORDAL, S. The Historical Element in the Icelandic Family Sagas. Glasgow. pp. 36. 5*s.*

NURMI, M. K. Blake's *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. Kent, Ohio. pp. viii + 64.

PEACOCK, R. The Art of Drama. pp. vi + 264. 25*s.*

PETOLA, N. The Compound Epithet and its Use in Modern American Poetry. Helsinki, 1956. pp. 300. Mk. 1200.

PETTER, H. Enitharmon. Stellung und Aufgabe eines Symbols im dichterischen Gesamtwerk William Blakes. Bern. pp. xii + 162.

PETTET, E. C. On the Poetry of Keats. pp. viii + 396. 35*s*.

QUINN, P. F. The French Face of Edgar Poe. Carbondale, Southern Illinois. pp. viii + 310. $5.00.

RAYSOR, T. M. (ed.). The English Romantic Poets. A Review of Research. [Revd.] New York, 1956; London. pp. viii + 308. 28*s*.

REID, J. C. The Mind and Art of Coventry Patmore. pp. viii + 358. 35*s*.

RIDEOUT, W. B. The Radical Novel in the United States 1900–1954. Cambridge, Mass., 1956; London. pp. xii + 340. 48*s*.

RIVOALLAN, A. Présence de Celtes. Paris. pp. iv + 444.

ROE, F. C. Sir Thomas Urquhart and Rabelais. Oxford. pp. 24. 2*s*. 6*d*.

ROLL-HANSEN, D. *The Academy* 1869–1879. Copenhagen. pp. 238. Kr. 27.50.

RYMER, T. Critical Works, ed. C. A. Zimansky. New Haven; London, 1956. pp. liv + 300. 48*s*.

SCHNYDER, H. Die Wiederbelebung des Mittelalters im humoristischen Abbild. Bern. pp. 148. Fr. 14.

SCOTT, A. F. The Poet's Craft. pp. xii + 220. 18*s*.

SHAKESPEARE, W. Supplement to Henry IV, Part I, ed. J. B. Evans (New Variorum Shakespeare). Washington, D.C., 1956. pp. iv + 122. $4.50.

— Henry the Fifth, 1600. Shakespeare Quarto Facsimile 9, ed. Sir W. Greg. Oxford. pp. viii + 54 plates. 25*s*.

— The Second Part of King Henry VI, ed. A. S. Cairncross (Arden edn.). pp. xliv + 198. 21*s*.

— King Henry VIII, ed. R. A. Foakes (Arden edn.). pp. lxvi + 216. 21*s*.

— Othello, ed. A. Walker and J. D. Wilson (The New Shakespeare). pp. lxx + 246. 17*s*. 6*d*.

SIEGEL, P. N. Shakespearean Tragedy and the Elizabethan Compromise. New York; London. pp. xvi + 244. $5.00.

SMITH, G., Jr. T. S. Eliot's Poetry and Plays. Chicago, 1956; London. pp. xii + 338. 45*s*.

SOCIETY FOR THEATRE RESEARCH. William Poel's Prompt Book of *Fratricide Punished*, ed. J. Isaacs. 1956. pp. xx + 36.

SPENSER, E. Minor Poems, ed. R. P. C. Mutter. pp. xii + 148. 7*s*.

SPINNER, K. George Farquhar als Dramatiker. Bern. pp. 120. Fr. 8.

STRAUSS, W. A. Proust and Literature. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. xii + 264. 38*s*.

SVENDSEN, K. Milton and Science. Cambridge, Mass., 1956; London. pp. xii + 304. 45*s*.

THORPE, C. D., BAKER, C., and WEAVER, B. (eds.). The Major English Romantic Poets. A Symposium in Reappraisal. Carbondale, Southern Illinois. pp. xviii + 270. $5.50.

TILANDER, G. (ed.). La Vénerie de Twiti. Uppsala, 1956. pp. 100. Kr. 12.

— Essais d'étymologie cynégétique. Lund. pp. 112.

TSCHOPP, E. Zur Verteilung von Vers und Prosa in Shakespeares Dramen. Bern. pp. 118. Fr. 8.

UNGER, L. The Man in the Name. Essays on the experience of poetry. Minneapolis, 1956. pp. xii + 250. 32*s*.

WAGNER, G. Wyndham Lewis. pp. xvi + 364. 35*s*.

WARREN, A. Richard Crashaw. [Reprint.] pp. xii + 260. 21*s*.

WATKINS, F. C. Thomas Wolfe's Characters. Norman, Oklahoma. pp. xiv + 194. $3.75.

WEISS, R. Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century. [2nd edn.] Oxford. pp. xxiv + 202. 25*s*.

WILDI, M. Die Dramen von T. S. Eliot. Zurich. pp. 152. Fr. 4.75.

WILES, R. M. Serial Publication in England before 1750. pp. xvi + 392. 50*s*.

WINNY, J. (ed.). The Frame of Order. pp. 224. 26*s*.

WOOD, H. G. Thought Life and Time as reflected in Science and Poetry. pp. vi + 58. 4*s*. 6*d*.

WOODRESS, J. Dissertations in American Literature 1891–1955. Durham, N.C. pp. x + 100. 15*s*.

WORDSWORTH, W. Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, ed. W. J. B. Owen. Copenhagen. pp. 204. Kr. 27.50.

YORK CYCLE OF MYSTERY PLAYS, ed. J. S. Purvis. pp. 384. 25*s*.

ZANDVOORT, R. W. Handbook of English Grammar. pp. xii + 352. 21*s*.

— and Assistants. Wartime English. Groningen. pp. x + 254. F. 7.90.

INDEX

Adams, R. M., *Ikon: John Milton and the Modern Critics*, noticed, 457.
Alleyn, E. See Whitlock, B. W. (letter).
Ancrene Riwle, The, tr. and ed. M. B. Salu, preface by J. R. R. Tolkien, introd. and appendix by Dom Gerard Sitwell, revd., 424.
Ancrene Wisse. See Russell-Smith, J. (note).
Anderson, D. M., note by, The Trial of the Princes in the *Arcadia*, Book V, 409.
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, The. See Dickins, B. (revd.).
Arnold, M. *The Scholar Gypsy*. See Dyson, A. E. (art.); see Müller-Schwefe (noticed).

Baldwin, R., *The Unity of the Canterbury Tales*, revd., 281.
Ballads. See Ingham, P. (art.).
Barclay, A., *The Life of St. George*, ed. W. Nelson, revd., 184.
Bartley, J. O., *Teague, Shenkin and Sawney. Being an historical study of the earliest Irish, Welsh and Scottish characters in English plays*, revd., 68.
Beal, A. See Lawrence, D. H.
Beer, E. S. de. See Evelyn, J.
Behre, F., *Meditative-Polemic 'Should' in Modern English 'That'-Clauses*, revd., 343.
Benjamin, E. B., note by, Sir John Hayward and Tacitus, 275.
Bennett, H. S., *Six Medieval Men and Women*, noticed, 217.
Bennett, J. A. W. (ed.), *Devotional Pieces in Verse and Prose* (Scottish Text Society), revd., 278. See Corbett, R.
Beowulf. See Wright, H. G. (art.).
Bishop, I., art. by, The Significance of the 'Garlande Gay' in the Allegory of *Pearl*, 12.
Black, M. W. See Shakespeare, W., *Richard II*.
Blair, P. H., *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England*, revd., 422.
Blanchard, R. See Steele, R.
Bliss, A. J. See *Sir Orfeo*.
Blount, M. See Schmitz, R. M. (art.).
Bowers, F., *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists*, revd., 293; see *Studies in Bibliography*; Whitman, W.
Boyce, B., *The Polemic Character 1640–61*, revd., 201.
Brinkley, R. F., *Coleridge on the Seventeenth Century*, revd., 101.
British Academy, *Proceedings*. See Willcock, G.
Brown, I. See Lindsay, D.
Brown, J. R. See Shakespeare, W., *The Merchant of Venice*.
Browne, T., *Religio Medici*, ed. J.-J. Denonain, revd., 71.
Burke, J. See Hogarth, W.

Cairncross, A. S., art. by, The Quarto and the Folio Text of *Richard III*, 225.
Carlton, W. J., art. by, The Third Man at Newgate, 402.
Carrington, C., *Rudyard Kipling. His Life and Work*, revd., 332.
Cazamian, L., *A History of French Literature*, revd., 214.
Cecil, D., *Walter Pater. The Scholar-Artist*, noticed, 218.
Chapin, C. F., *Personification in Eighteenth-Century Poetry*, revd., 310.
Chapman, G. See Rees, E. (revd.).
Chaucer, G., *The Canterbury Tales*. See Baldwin, R.; Lumiansky, R. M.; Griffith, D. D. (revd.).
Chinol, E., *P. B. Shelley*, revd., 323.
Clark, C. See *Peterborough Chronicle*.
Clemen, W., *Clarences Traum und Ermordung*, noticed, 347.
Clemoes, P., *Liturgical Influence on Punctuation in Late Old English and Early Middle English Manuscripts*, revd., 177.
Clifford, E., art. by, 'The Trumpet-Major Notebook' and *The Dynasts*, 149.
Coleridge, S. T. *The Ancient Mariner*. See Purser, J. W. R. (art.); *The Collected Letters of S.T.C.*, vols. i and ii, ed. E. L. Griggs, revd., 448; see Brinkley, R. F. (revd.).
Communications Research Centre. See *Studies in Communication*.
Contention, The. See Prouty, C. T. (revd.).
Corbett, R., *The Poems of R.C.*, ed. J. A. W. Bennett and H. R. Trevor-Roper, revd., 70.
Court of Venus, The, ed. R. A. Fraser, revd., 282.
Craig, H., *English Religious Drama of the Middle Ages*, revd., 426.
Crawford, T., *The Edinburgh Review and Romantic Poetry* (1802–29), noticed, 349.

Daborne, R., *The Poor Man's Comfort* (Malone Society), revd., 289.
Daniel, S., *Cleopatra*. See Schanzer, E. (art.).

Danielsson, B., *John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation*, Part I, revd., 187.
Darbishire, H., letter by, The Text of *Paradise Lost*, 173; see Milton, J., *The Poetical Works*.
Davidson, E. H. See Hawthorne, N., *Dr. Grimshawe's Secret*.
Davie, D., *Articulate Energy. An Inquiry into the Syntax of English Poetry*, revd., 212.
Davis, H. See Swift, J.
Davis, R. B., *George Sandys. Poet-Adventurer*, revd., 200.
Defoe, D., *The Letters of D.D.*, ed. G. H. Healey, revd., 95.
Denonain, J.-J. See Browne, T., *Religio Medici*.
Dick of Devonshire (Malone Society), revd., 289.
Dickens, C. See Carlton, W. J. (art.).
Dickins, B., *The Genealogical Preface to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, revd., 177.
Diderot, D. See Fredman, A. G. (revd.).
Donne, J., *The Sermons of J. D.*, ed. G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson, vols. ii and vii, revd., 434; see Whitlock, B. W. (letter).
Dryden, J., *The Works of J. D.*, vol. i, *Poems 1649–1680*, ed. E. N. Hooker and H. T. Swedenberg, revd., 445.
Dudley, R., Earl of Leicester. See Rosenberg, E. (revd.).
Dyson, A. E., art. by, The Last Enchantments, 257.

Edinburgh Review, The. See Crawford, T. (noticed).
Ekwall, E., note by, A Hundred-Name, 408.
Essays by Divers Hands, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, New Series, vol. xxvii, ed. Sir G. R. Hamilton, revd., 336.
Evelyn, J., *The Diary of J. E.*, ed. E. S. de Beer, revd., 205.
Everett, D., *Essays on Middle English Literature*, ed. P. Kean, revd., 178.

Feil, J. P., note by, James Shirley's Years of Service, 413.
Ford, J. See Oliver, H. J. (noticed).
Frank, J., *The Levellers. A History of Three Seventeenth-Century Social Democrats: John Lilburne, Richard Overton, William Walwyn*, revd., 307.
Fraser, R. A. See *Court of Venus, The*.
Fredman, A. G., *Diderot and Sterne*, revd., 98.
Freeman, M., *D. H. Lawrence. A Basic Study of his Ideas*, revd., 334.
Freeman, P., art. by, Two Fragments of Walsh Manuscripts, 390.

Gibbon, E., *The Letters of E. G.*, vols. i–iii, ed. J. E. Norton, revd., 322.
Gifford, H. See Tucker, S. I., and Gifford, H. (art.).
Gneuss, H., *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen*, revd., 45.
Gower, J. See Wickert, M. (revd.).
Griffith, D. D., *Bibliography of Chaucer 1908–53*, revd., 180.
Griggs, E. L. See Coleridge, S. T.

Haber, T. B. See Housman, A. E.
Hakluyt Society. See Quinn, D. B.
Haller, W., *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*, revd., 305.
Hamilton, A. C., art. by, Spenser and Tourneur's *Transformed Metamorphosis*, 127.
Hamilton, Sir G. R. See *Essays by Divers Hands*.
Hanham, A., note by, The Musical Studies of a Fifteenth-Century Wool Merchant, 270.
Hardy, T., *The Trumpet-Major* and *The Dynasts*. See Clifford, E. (art.).
Hart, J. See Danielsson, B. (revd.).
Hawthorne, N., *Dr. Grimshawe's Secret*, ed. E. H. Davidson, noticed, 219.
Hayward, Sir J. See Benjamin, E. B. (note).
Healey, G. D. See Defoe, D., *Letters*.
Henry VII. See Scammell, G. V.
Hill, B., note by, Four Anglo-Saxon Compounds, 162.
Hogarth, W., *The Analysis of Beauty*, ed. J. Burke, revd., 319.
Hooker, E. N. See Dryden, J.
Horsford, H. C. See Melville, H.
Housman, A. E., *The Manuscript Poems of A. E. H.*, ed. T. B. Haber, revd., 104.

Ingham, P., art. by, The World of the Ballad, 22.

Johnson, S. See Lascelles, M.; Tucker, S. I., and Gifford, H. (arts.); Joyce, M. (noticed).
Joyce, M., *Samuel Johnson*, noticed, 107.
July and Julian (Malone Society), revd., 289.

Kean, P. See Everett, D.
Ker, W. P., *The Dark Ages*, revd., 209; *On Modern Literature*, ed. T. Spencer and J. Sutherland, revd., 210.
Kinsley, J. See Lindsay, D.
Kipling, R. See Carrington, C. (revd.).
Knight, G. W., *Laureate of Peace. On the Genius of Alexander Pope*, revd., 96; *The Mutual Flame. On Shakespeare's 'Sonnets' and 'The Phoenix and the Turtle'*, revd., 302.
Kreuzer, J. R., *Elements of Poetry*, revd., 340.

Kuhn, S. M., art. by, Some Early Mercian Manuscripts [with rejoinder by K. Sisam], 355.

Lam, G. L. See Walpole, H.
Langland, W., *Piers Plowman*. See Lawlor, J. (art.); Maisack, H. (noticed).
Laqueur, R., *Shakespeares dramatische Konzeption*, revd., 301.
Lascelles, M., art. by, Johnson's Last Allusion to Mary Queen of Scots, 32.
Lawlor, J., art. by, The Imaginative Unity of *Piers Plowman*, 113.
Lawrence, D. H., *Select Literary Criticism*, ed. A. Beal, revd., 334; see Freeman, M. (revd.).
Leclaire, L., (1) *Le Roman régionaliste dans les Iles britanniques, 1800–1950*; (2) *A General Analytical Bibliography of the Regional Novelists of the British Isles, 1800–1950*, revd., 102.
Legouis, P., art. by, Marvell and the New Critics, 382.
Lever, J. W., *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet*, revd., 429.
Levin, H., *The Overreacher; A Study of Christopher Marlowe*, revd., 189.
Lewis, W. S. See Walpole, H.
Lilburne, J. See Frank, J. (revd.).
Lindsay, D., *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaits*, ed. J. Kinsley, with a Critical Introduction by A. M. Mackenzie and a Foreword by I. Brown, revd., 59.
Long, J. H., *Shakespeare's Use of Music. A Study of the Music and its Performance in the Original Productions of Seven Comedies*, revd., 64.
Longinus. See Spencer, T. J. B. (art.).
Lumiansky, R. M., *Of Sondry Folk. The Dramatic Principle in the 'Canterbury Tales'*, revd., 181.

Mack, M. Some Annotations in the Second Earl of Oxford's Copies of Pope's *Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* and *Sober Advice from Horace*, 416.
Mackenzie, A. M. See Lindsay, D.
Maclean, C. M., *Mark Rutherford. A Biography of William Hale White*, revd., 330.
Maisack, H., *William Langlands Verhältnis zum Zisterziensischen Mönchtum*, noticed, 456.
Malone Society. See Daborne, R., *The Poor Mans Comfort*; *Dick of Devonshire*; *July and Julian* (revd.).
Malone Society Collections III. A Calendar of Dramatic Records in the Books of the Livery Companies of London 1485–1640, revd., 283.
Mann, H. See Walpole, H.
Marlowe, C. See Levin, H. (revd.).
Martz, L. L., *The Poetry of Meditation*, revd., 194.
Marvell, A. See Legouis, P. (art.).
Mary Queen of Scots. See Lascelles, M. (art.).
Melville, H., *Journal of a Visit to Europe and the Levant*, ed. H. C. Horsford, revd., 450; see Rosenberry, E. H. (revd.).
Meyerhoff, H., *Time in Literature*, revd., 342.
Middleton, T. See Schoenbaum, S. (revd.).
Milton, J., *The Poetical Works of J. M.*, vols. i and ii, ed. H. Darbishire, revd., 78; *Paradise Lost*. See Darbishire, H. (letter); see Spencer, T. J. B. (art.); Muir, K.; Schultz, H.; Watkins, W. B. C. (revd.); Adams, R. M.; West, R. H. (noticed).
Muir, K., *John Milton*, revd., 203.
Müller-Schwefe, G., *Das persönliche Menschenbild Matthew Arnolds in der dichterischen Gestaltung*, noticed, 349.
Mummendey, R., *Language and Literature of the Anglo-Saxon Nations as presented in German Doctoral Dissertations 1885–1950. A Bibliography*, revd., 277.
Musgrove, S., note by, *King Lear*, I. i. 170, 170.

Nelson, W. See Barclay, A., *The Life of St. George*.
New Variorum Shakespeare. See Shakespeare, W., *Richard II*.
Nicoll, A., *A History of English Drama 1660–1900*, vol. iv: Early Nineteenth-Century Drama, noticed, 108; see *Shakespeare Survey 8*.
Norton, J. E. See Gibbon, E.
Nosworthy, J. M. See Shakespeare, W., *Cymbeline*.

Oliver, H. J., *The Problem of John Ford*, noticed, 347.
Oppel, H., *Shakespeares Tragödien und Romanzen: Kontinuität oder Umbruch?*, noticed, 107.
Overton, R. See Frank, J. (revd.).

Parry, J. J., *Studies in Memory of J. J. P. By Members of the English Department, University of Illinois*, noticed, 350.
Pater, W. See Cecil, D. (noticed).
Pearl. See Bishop, I. (art.).
Periodical Literature, Summary of, 109, 219, 351, 458.
Peterborough Chronicle, The, ed. D. Whitelock with an Appendix by C. Clark, revd., 51.
Pope, A., *Epistle to Arbuthnot* and *Sober Advice from Horace*. See Mack, M. (note); Birthday Lines to Martha Blount. See Schmitz, R. M. (art.); *The Dunciad*.

See Williams, A. L. (revd.); see Knight, G. W. (revd.).
Potter, G. R. See Donne, J.
Price, C., art. by, Six Letters by Christopher Smart, 144.
Prouty, C. T., *The Contention* and Shakespeare's *2 Henry VI*, revd., 60.
Publications Received, List of, 222, 461.
Purser, J. W. R., art. by, Interpretation of *The Ancient Mariner*, 249.

Quinn, D B. (ed.), *The Roanoke Voyages 1584–1590* (Hakluyt Society), revd., 287.
Quintana, R., *Swift. An Introduction*, revd., 206.
Quirk, R., and Wrenn, C. L., *An Old English Grammar*, revd., 43.

R., J., letter by, Sir Philip Sidney, 42.
Ray, G. N., *Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity, 1811–1846*, revd., 325.
Rees, E., *The Tragedies of George Chapman*, revd., 67.
Rees, J., note by, The Preface to *The Cenci*, 172.
Richards, I. A., *Speculative Instruments*, revd., 339.
Rogers, H. L. See Scammell, G. V., and Rogers, H. L. (note).
Rosenberg, E., *Leicester Patron of Letters*, revd., 285.
Rosenberry, E. H., *Melville and the Comic Spirit*, revd., 328.
Royal Society of Literature, *Transactions*. See *Essays by Divers Hands*.
Russell-Smith, J., note by, Ridiculosae Sternutationes (*o nore* in *Ancrene Wisse*), 266.
Rutherford, M. See Maclean, C. M. (revd.).

Salter, F. M., *Medieval Drama in Chester*, revd., 183.
Salu, M. B. See *Ancrene Riwle, The*.
Sandys, G. See Davis, R. B. (revd.).
Scammell, G. V., and Rogers, H. L., note by, An Elegy on Henry VII, 167.
Schanzer, E., art. by, Daniel's Revision of his *Cleopatra*, 375.
Schmitz, R. M., art. by, Two New Holographs of Pope's Birthday Lines to Martha Blount, 234.
Schoenbaum, S., *Middleton's Tragedies. A Critical Study*, revd., 193.
Schultz, H., *Milton and Forbidden Knowledge*, revd., 443.
Scott, W., note by, Smollett's *The Tears of Scotland*, 38.
Scottish Text Society. See Bennett, J. A. W.
Shakespeare, W., *Cymbeline*, ed. J. M. Nosworthy (Arden), revd., 432; *2 Henry VI*. See Prouty, C. T. (revd.); *King Lear*. See Musgrove, S. (note); *The Merchant of Venice*, ed. J. R. Brown (Arden), revd., 191; *The Phoenix and the Turtle*. See Knight, G. W. (revd.); *Richard II*, ed. M. W. Black (New Variorum), revd., 290; *Richard III*. See Cairncross, A. S. (art.); Clemen, W. (noticed); *Sonnets*. See Knight, G. W. (revd.); see Bowers, F.; Laqueur, R.; Long, J. H.; Sisson, C. J. (revd.); Oppel, H.; Willcock, G. (noticed).
Shakespeare Survey 8, ed. A. Nicoll, revd., 63.
Shelley, P. B., *The Cenci*. See Rees, J. (note); Chinol, E. (revd.).
Shirley, J. See Feil, J. P. (note).
Sidney, P., *Arcadia*. See Anderson, D. M. (note); see R., J. (letter).
Simpson, E. M. See Donne, J.
Sir Orfeo, ed. A. J. Bliss, revd., 57.
Sisam, K. See Kuhn, S. M.
Sisson, C. J., *New Readings in Shakespeare*, revd., 298.
Sitwell, G. See *Ancrene Riwle, The*.
Smart, C. See Price, C. (art.).
Smith, W. H. See Walpole, H.
Smollett, T., *The Tears of Scotland*. See Scott, W. (note).
Spencer, T. J. B., art. by, Longinus in English Criticism: Influences before Milton, 137; see Ker, W. P., *On Modern Literature*.
Spenser, E. See Hamilton, A. C. (art.).
Steele, R., *'The Englishman'. A Political Journal by R.S.*, ed. R. Blanchard, revd., 315.
Stenton, F. M., *The Latin Charters of the Anglo-Saxon Period*, revd., 176.
Sterne, L. See Fredman, A. G.; Traugott, J. (revd.).
Stratman, C. J., *Bibliography of Medieval Drama*, revd., 279.
Studies in Bibliography, ed. F. Bowers, vol. vii, revd., 215; vol. viii, revd., 454.
Studies in Communication contributed to the Communications Research Centre, University College, London, revd., 345.
Sutherland, J. See Ker, W. P., *On Modern Literature*.
Swedenberg, H. T. See Dryden, J.
Swift, J., *The Prose Writings of J. S., vol. xii. Irish Tracts 1728–1733*, ed. H. Davis, revd., 311; see Quintana, R. (revd.).

Tacitus. See Benjamin, E. B. (note).
Thackeray, W. M. See Ray, G. N. (revd.).
Tolkien, J. R. R. See *Ancrene Riwle, The*.
Tourneur, C., *Transformed Metamorphosis*. See Hamilton, A. C. (art.).

Traugott, J., *Tristram Shandy's World. Sterne's Philosophical Rhetoric*, revd., 320.
Trevor-Roper, H. R. See Corbett, R.
Tucker, S. I., and Gifford, H., art. by, Johnson's Poetic Imagination, 241.

Wain, J. (ed.), *Interpretations*, revd., 451.
Walpole, H., *H. W.'s Correspondence with Sir Horace Mann*, ed. W. S. Lewis, W. H. Smith, and G. L. Lam, revd., 100.
Walsh, W. See Freeman, P. (art.).
Walton, G., *Metaphysical to Augustan*, noticed, 107.
Walwyn, W. See Frank, J. (revd.).
Watkins, W. B. C., *An Anatomy of Milton's Verse*, revd., 309.
West, R. H., *Milton and the Angels*, noticed, 348.
Whitlock, B. W., letter by, Edward Alleyn's Draft Letter to John Donne, 420.
Whitelock, D. See *Peterborough Chronicle*.
White, W. H. See Maclean, C. M. (revd.).
Whitman, W. *Whitman's Manuscripts*; *Leaves of Grass* (1860), ed. F. Bowers, revd., 326.
Wickert, M., *Studien zu John Gower*, revd., 54.
Willcock, G., *Language and Poetry in Shakespeare's Early Plays* (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, xl), noticed, 347.
Williams, A. L., *Pope's 'Dunciad'. A Study of its Meaning*, revd., 316.
Wrenn, C. L. See Quirk, R.
Wright, H. G., art. by, Good and Evil; Light and Darkness; Joy and Sorrow in *Beowulf*, 1.

THE DICKENSIAN

53rd YEAR OF PUBLICATION

Devoted to the study of Dickens. Published by the Dickens Fellowship in January, May, and September

12*s.* 6*d.* per annum, post free

Specimen copy on request

'This is a monument if you like; the continued prosperity of this periodical is a finer testimony to the glory and honour of its subject than any bronze or marble could be.' E. V. LUCAS

THE DICKENS HOUSE
48 Doughty Street, London, W.C. 1

Early English Text Society

New texts issued in 1957:

No. 234 **Caxton: Paris and Vienne,** ed. MacEdward Leach. 30*s.*

237 **Kyng Alisaunder,** ed. G. V. Smithers. Vol. II (Introduction, Commentary, and Glossary). 37*s.* 6*d.*

238 **The Phonetic Writings of Robert Robinson,** ed. E. J. Dobson. 28*s.*

239 **The Bibliotheca Historica of Diodorus Siculus, translated by John Skelton,** ed. F. M. Salter and H. L. R. Edwards. Vol. II (Introduction, Notes, and Glossary). 15*s.*

Reprints issued in 1957:

O.S. 51 **Liflade of St. Juliana,** ed. Cockayne and Brock. 25*s.*

O.S. 83 **The Oldest English Texts,** ed. Sweet. 42*s.*

E.S. 69 **Lydgate's Assembly of the Gods,** ed. Triggs. 25*s.*

E.S. 81, 82 **The English Works of Gower,** ed. Macaulay. 40*s.* each volume

E.S. 87 **Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays,** ed. Craig. Second Edition. 15*s.*

No. 191A **On the Continuity of English Prose,** by R. W. Chambers. 14*s.*

222 **Ro. Ba.'s Life of More,** ed. Hitchcock and Hallett. 35*s.*

224 **Athelston,** ed. Trounce. 15*s.*

225 **Ancrene Riwle, Nero MS.,** ed. Day. 25*s.*

229 **Ancrene Riwle, Caius MS.,** ed. Wilson. 25*s.*

Obtainable through any bookseller or direct from the Society's publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

A complete list of publications is available on application to the Secretary, R. W. Burchfield, 40 Walton Crescent, Oxford.

Printed in Great Britain by Charles Batey at the University Press, Oxford